The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXIX, No. 5 NOVEMBER 1948

CONTENTS

The Holy Father Orders the Participation of the Laity in the Mission of the Hierarchy *Bishop Edwin V. O'Hara* 321

Charged with the Grandeur of God . *E. A. Ryan, S.J.* 328

Is "Rhythm" per se Illicit? . *Hugh J. O'Connell, C.SS.R.* 336

Ratum Non Consummatum . *Thomas Owen Martin* 348

A Need and a Remedy . . . . *Thomas Trese, S.J.* 361

The Priest in Radio. Part II . . *William C. Smith* 367

Factors in Church Unity . . . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 375

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Pastor's Telephone 384

A Doubt about Baptism 385

Bacon as a Condiment 386

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States and Canada $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1948, by The Catholic University of America Press

Local Calendar and *Oratio imperata* in Private Chapels . 386

Rooms above or below Churches and Chapels . . . 387

Oratio imperata at a Nuptial Mass 388

The Master of Ceremonies at *Missa cantata* . . . 388

ANALECTA 390

BOOK REVIEWS

Patristique et moyen âge. Tome II. *by J. de Ghellinck, S.J.* 395

The Apostolic Fathers. *translated by Francis X. Glimm, Joseph M. F. Marique, S.J., and Gerald Walsh, S.J.* 398

The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch . . *translated by James A. Kleist, S.J.* 398

Give This Man Place. . . . *by Hugh F. Blunt* 400

A CHRISTMAS SUGGESTION FOR EVERY PRIEST

Why not give a year's subscription to The American Ecclesiastical Review?

To—*Your Priest Friends* • *The Newly Ordained* • *Seminarians*

Twelve times a year your thoughtful gift will bring renewed spiritual and intellectual inspiration, with gratitude for the giver.

A gift card will be sent on your directive.

Don't wait. Make up your list today.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
The Catholic University of America Press
Washington 17, D. C.

Gentlemen: Please send gift subscription to the following:

Name.....

Address.....

City..... Zone..... State.....

I enclose my check for $.....

United States and Canada $4.50; $5.00 Foreign

List additional names on separate sheet.

THE HOLY FATHER ORDERS THE PARTICIPATION OF THE LAITY IN THE MISSION OF THE HIERARCHY

It is obvious from the title of this paper that no mere generic discussion of Catholic Action is envisioned. Since all of us are acquainted with what the Supreme Pontiffs have said about the character, purpose, scope and urgency of the lay apostolate, I shall by way of introduction give only a brief quotation from Pope Pius XI on each of these points.

On the *character* of the lay apostolate Pius XI wrote:

> In reality to consider them well, it is the Sacrament of Baptism and Confirmation themselves that impose, among other obligations that of the apostolate, of spiritual assistance to our neighbor. In fact, by Confirmation a man becomes a soldier of Christ. Now who does not see that a soldier ought to face fatigue and combat less for himself than for others?
>
> Recall to the attention of your faithful that it is in working in the field of the private and public apostolate, under your direction and that of your clergy that they may merit the magnificent title of "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people."

These words of the Holy Father show clearly that the lay apostolate flows immediately from the sacramental system entrusted to the Church.

Concerning the *purpose* of the lay apostolate, Pius XI in a speech on April 19, 1931, said:

> The supreme aim of Catholic Action is the diffusion, defense and application of the faith and of Christian Doctrine to life, individual, domestic and civil. . . . The hierarchical apostolate of the Church and Catholic Action which co-operates therewith, aim at the entire program of the Heart of God: the foundation, expansion and consolidation of the Kingdom of God in Souls, in families and in society—in all the depths that human activity can sound when the grace of God is helping it.

These striking expressions of the Vicar of Christ manifest the identity of purpose shared by the lay apostolate and the apostolate of the hierarchy.

Referring to the *scope* or *extent* of the lay apostolate, Pius XI observed:

The field of Catholic Action is as vast as that of the hierarchical apostolate. Just as the hierarchical apostolate was confided to the Church, to the bishops and the priests for the expansion of the Reign of Christ, for the salvation of souls, for the glory of God, for the honor of Holy Church, so also, in all these domains a field of action is open to all the laity, who fully conscious of their duties to God and to the Church, wish to consecrate their activity to the service of the Lord and their brethren, at the side of bishops and priests, under the direction and discipline of the hierarchy.

It is evident from these words that the lay apostolate is not limited in scope to any so-called specialized fields of Catholic Action but is as diversified and vast as the hierarchical apostolate.

Finally, speaking of the *urgency* of preparing the lay apostolate, Pius XI made the following statement:

You see clearly the manner of the times in which we are living and what they demand from Catholic forces. On the one hand we deplore society growing ever more pagan. On the other hand we grieve because the clergy is quite insufficient to cope with the necessities of our times. Hence it is necessary that all men be apostles. It is necessary that the Catholic laity stand not idle, but united with the ecclesiastical hierarchy, ready to obey its orders and to take its share in the holy warfare; and by complete self-dedication and prayer, and strength of will and action, co-operate with the reflowering of faith and the reformation of Christian morals.

These powerful words of Pope Pius XI, which sound a battle cry and proclaim a crusade, could be matched by the utterances of Pius X, Benedict XV and of His Holiness Pope Pius XII. I shall not weaken them by attempting an analysis of their plain meaning. Their realization has been committed to each bishop in his own diocese. I shall therefore describe briefly how we have tried to give them application in the Diocese of Kansas City.

In harmony with the pattern set up nationally by the bishops of the United States, we have organized the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and the diocesan councils of men, women and youth. On February 24, 1940, the Mandate of Catholic Action in the Diocese was given to these organizations and to all their affiliated apostolic sections. All Catholics in the Diocese were invited to become associated with one or other of these groups in each parish. On the occasion of my biennial tour of Confirmation I have explained to the laity in every parish during the

past eight years the responsibility of the lay apostolate growing from the Sacrament of Confirmation, and have pointed out the avenues of co-operation with the bishop and pastors which we were opening in each parish.

On these occasions I have explained the call of the Sovereign Pontiffs to the laity to dedicate themselves to the expansion of the Kingdom of Christ. I have made it clear that there are two types of spiritual societies or groups in a parish, both approved by the Church—one which a person joins primarily for his own sanctification, the other primarily to help his neighbors in their spiritual life. To the first class belong the Holy Name Society, Rosary and Altar Societies, and similar pious unions which bring their members close to our Lord and his holy Mother. These are basic in any spiritual program in a parish. But it is not enough to save our own souls. We must communicate to others the gifts of faith which we have so freely received. If this is true of every baptized Catholic it is emphatically the duty of every person who receives the Holy Spirit in Confirmation.

The problem arises as to how the individual Catholic lay man, woman or youth is to exercise the apostolic responsibility accepted in Confirmation. To assist in answering this question the Church provides the second group of parish societies which have for their primary objective the spiritual good of others. These societies of Catholic Action receive their specific commission from the mandate of the bishop. As has already been said, this mandate has been given in our diocese to the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and to the councils of men, women and youth. These organizations and groups have as their essential purpose to provide opportunity and direction for our people in the lay apostolate. Their function is to open areas wherein the lay apostolate may be exercised fruitfully and without fear of intruding on the fields being cultivated by others. Their aim is to recruit militant Catholics to co-operate with their bishop and their pastors in the whole sphere of the Church's work. Their preparation and training devolves primarily upon the pastors in the respective parishes. It is clear that these two groups of organizations, namely, those primarily devoted to the personal sanctification of their members and those primarily devoted to the works of the lay apostolate must co-operate with each other in many ways, but each must pursue its own proper objective in an independent manner.

It is the function then of the councils of men, women and youth and of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine to explore the field of Catholic Action, to open lines of communication and co-operation in the lay apostolate, to seek and develop zealous lay leaders and assign them definite tasks. In preparing these leaders the pastoral clergy have a duty which requires both zeal and prudence. In order that one may fruitfully exercise the lay apostolate there is need of study joined with prayer, of decision strengthened by grace and of action prudently guided by ecclesiastical authority. Who has not been witness to the confusion and frustration born of the undirected activities of good and zealous lay individuals. Some pastors who have had such unhappy experience are slow to enter upon the direction of the lay apostolate. They consider all effort of the laity in the apostolate as intrusions upon the priest's proper field of work and as bound to create confusion. Consequently they say: "Let the laity be faithful at their prayers, attend Mass, support the Church and live Christian lives in their families and places of work and recreation."

Such, however, is not the mind of the Vicar of Christ. The Holy Father calls on bishops and priests to recruit and train and direct lay apostles—not a few, but many in every walk of life. And it is my own most enduring conviction that the greatest loss to religion is caused by our failure to harness to the chariot of Christ the vast forces of intelligence and good will available among our lay people.

We have faced the problem of enlisting and training lay apostles in our parishes and diocese, and we have found that for the effective functioning of apostolic groups two things are needed—an assignment of definite tasks and the spiritual formation, the spiritual motivation of the apostles. The respective diocesan boards have as their principal duty the outlining of the program for the various apostolic groups in their section of the annual Catholic Action Workshop. The work of providing spiritual motivation for the apostolate is performed in our lay retreats, days of recollection and hours of adoration before the Blessed Sacrament. In our diocesan retreat house, attendance at which is promoted by the councils of men and women, all the retreats have one extended period of panel discussion by the retreatants on their responsibilities in the lay apostolate. This panel discussion gives a character of Catholic Action to the whole retreat.

Besides the weekend retreats there are numerous days of recollection in which the various groups of lay apostles consider their obligations. A typical day of recollection sees between twenty and fifty leaders assembled in some convent or parish chapel for Mass, Holy Communion and a homily. After breakfast the spiritual director opens a panel discussion on the duties of the particular group which is conducted by the leaders themselves. Lunch is preceded by an examination of conscience and the recital of the Rosary; after lunch the group assembles again for a panel discussion. A sermon and Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament close the day.

Hours of adoration either in the parish church or in the chapel of Perpetual Adoration are depended upon to nourish the spirit of the apostolate from week to week.

The technical training of the apostolate is carried on intensively in our Annual Workshop of Catholic Action and in the meetings of the Parish Catholic Action Executive Board. The annual diocesan Workshop of Catholic Action is conducted during the first week in May in Kansas City and then for a single day at three distinct centers of the diocese, each distant one hundred miles from the See City. Except for a religious ceremony under the auspices of the Young Catholic Workers, no mass meetings are held during the Workshop. There are only working assemblies of the various sections of Catholic Action. In each section a report of the past year is made, failures are assessed, successes analyzed, objectives clarified and plans laid for the coming year. At the Workshop in May of this year nearly thirty sectional meetings of the apostolate were held in Kansas City alone and the combined attendance there at all sessions was approximately three thousand men, women and youth.

The basic indoctrination, of course, of all apostles is the same, namely, an understanding of the deadly impact of secularism on contemporary life and the dynamic power of the Mystical Body to restore society to God. To form lay apostles and to mobilize the Christian offensive for the conquest of each environment for Christ is the aim of our Workshop of Catholic Action.

Perhaps the most important force in the diocesan program is the Parish Catholic Action Executive Board, which is composed of the Parish Confraternity of Christian Doctrine Committee and representatives from other groups of the lay apostolate in the parish. It is here that the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine

makes an immense contribution to the entire lay apostolate. Since, as His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate has frequently observed, the Confraternity with its program of evangelization occupies the choice field of Catholic Action, it is able to motivate and strengthen the lay apostles in every other field. Each of its five sections is at the very heart of Catholic Action and reaps its own rich harvest. The instruction of public school children on the elementary school level demands well-prepared teachers, fishers and helpers in considerable numbers. Public high school youth need apostolic leaders furnished by the Parish Confraternity. Seven thousand families in our diocese engaged in religious discussion clubs require a corps of trained leaders in each parish. The Parent-Educator section of the Confraternity ministers to the parents of many thousands of pre-school children and finally our parish sections of the Apostolate of Good Will are sponsoring an extensive street preaching program which will reach large audiences in no less than seventy villages.

The Parish Catholic Action Executive Board may be described as the parent unit of the parish lay apostolate. Its regular meeting is intended to kindle the apostolic ardor of its members and send them forth to renew the zeal of their various affiliated groups in the parish. Each meeting, opening with a devotional exercise, provides a prepared program of discussion of the practical problems of religious formation in the parish. This affords opportunity to present for inquiry secularism as it affects and devitalizes the families, workers, farmers, students and professional classes of the parish. Each meeting concludes with a prayer for the beatification of the Servant of God, Pope Pius X, to whom under God the Confraternity owes its present development.

Thus far I have restricted my remarks to our diocesan program of Catholic Action as it functions on the parochial level. A full picture would demand reference to our inter-parochial activities likewise, such as the Young Catholic Students groups and our Pre-Cana counselling of young unmarried men and women. But time does not permit a full treatment of the subject.

I am quite aware of the distance yet to be traversed in developing lay apostles in our diocese and in enlisting them in the program of Catholic Action. Nevertheless, I am heartened by the wholesouled response on the part of several thousand lay men and women and youth to my invitation to collaborate with their bishop

and with their pastors in extending the Kingdom of Christ. A gentleman wrote recently that he is happy that we are beginning to train lay apostles. I replied that the formation of lay apostles had been a major pre-occupation with me ever since my consecration eighteen years ago. It has also been the happiest experience of my life. I have personal memories of parents given me by God who were truly intelligent and zealous lay apostles, and I have found them reproduced by the score in every parish. There they await an invitation to collaborate with their bishop and with their pastors in every field of evangelization.

✠ EDWIN V. O'HARA
Bishop of Kansas City

HOPE IN THE PRIEST

What motive to confidence is wanting to the priest? He is encompassed by the signs of God's love and power. The will of God to save him eternally is made known to him by every token and pledge short of a direct and personal revelation. This strong and changeless confidence is a motive to self-oblation in greater things and to self-denial in the less. Hope is a source of joy, and joy is a source of strength. The downcast and timid are weak and inert. The hopeful and confident and energetic and courageous. Fear does not honor our Divine Master. But trust springs from a perception of His love. Hope is a gift of the Holy Ghost, infused in Baptism and matured by exercise. St. Paul says that we are saved by hope, and he prays, "The God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that you may abound in hope and in the power of the Holy Ghost" (Romans, 15:13).

Gedeon's three hundred men who lapped the water were of more worth in the battle than the multitude that drank kneeling and the two-and-twenty thousands fearful and timorous who went away (Judges, 7:3-7). The proclamation sounds to this day along the whole line of those who aspire to the priesthood: "What man is there that is fearful and faint-hearted? Let him go and return to his house, lest he make the hearts of his brethren to fear, as he himself is possessed by fear" (Deut., 20:8). If he be faithful, the hand of his Divine Master will be a helmet of salvation upon his head.

—Cardinal Manning, in *The Eternal Priesthood* (Baltimore: Murphy, no date), pp. 119 f.

CHARGED WITH THE GRANDEUR OF GOD

True love consists in deeds more than in words. "Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord', shall enter the kingdom of heaven" (*Matt. 7*:21). The true lover shares with his beloved what he has, be it knowledge, honors, riches or anything else. The Lord counselled us to do good to our enemies, but we do not need to be told to do good to our friends.

God is love, and His love has been made manifest both in word and in deed. In the Holy Scriptures we read how God loved mankind and how He has been lavish in his gifts to men. Now the human heart is naturally grateful. Once persuaded that he is the object of God's loving kindness, man will not fail to return love for love. It is indispensable, therefore, that we should recognize God's gifts to us. "If thou didst know the gift of God" (*John* 4:10). We can know them in the Holy Spirit: "What we have received is no spirit of worldly wisdom; it is the Spirit that comes from God, to make us understand God's gifts to us" (*I Cor. 2*:12). The Holy Spirit gives to those who ask it earnestly and repeatedly an intimate knowledge of the many and great benefits they have received from God and makes them thoroughly grateful and ready to love and serve His divine majesty in all things. Gilbert K. Chesterton has told us how for a time before he turned to the Catholic Church he clung to God " by the one thin thread of thanks." Even though but a thread, gratitude is a strong bond. With God's help and life's teaching the thread can become stronger than a cord or a cable. Create grateful hearts in us, O Lord!

I. GOD OUR BENEFACTOR

"It is truly meet and just, right and salutary that we should always and in all places give thanks to Thee, O holy Lord, Father almighty, eternal God." So prays the Church in the Preface of the Mass, and those who carry out this program are on the highway of divine love. In order to do it, however, we have to realise that always and in all places we receive divine favors. God tells us: "I have loved thee with an everlasting love, therefore have I drawn thee, taking pity on thee" (*Jer.* 31:3). God has drawn us by the the cords of Adam. All that by nature we are, all that by nature we possess God has bestowed on us. He has given us ourselves made to His image and likeness. All the perfections of our souls

and bodies are His gifts and are preserved by His power. We should not be intelligent if God had not made us intelligent; we should not be capable if God had not made us capable; we should not be kind if God had not shared His kindness with us. Even on the natural plane, then, we owe God gratitude and love.

Now in addition to natural gifts, God has granted us the spiritual gift of His wondrous grace. This should make us even more grateful. "It shall be said to them: 'Ye are the sons of the living God.'" (*Osee* 1:10). What a sublime dignity, one that makes us partakers of the divine nature! "Behold what manner of charity the Father has bestowed on us that we should be called and should be the sons of God" (*I John* 3:1). This sonship is not lost forever if we are rebellious and recalcitrant. Even then God continues to invite us to accept it again in its fulness: "If your sins be as scarlet, they shall be made as white as snow; if they be red as crimson, they shall be white as wool" (*Isaias* 1:18). Love and gratitude will blossom in our hearts especially when we consider what God's love has cost Him.

To show us the way to heaven, our Lord came as our brother in the flesh. To redeem us He offered Himself as the price of our salvation on the cross. To fortify us He gives Himself to us as our spiritual food. In a certain manner our Lord parted with the perfect enjoyment of heavenly bliss that He might make us sharers in it. He took upon Himself our miseries to shield us from them. He chose to be sold that we might be redeemed, dishonored that we might be glorified, and poor that we might be enriched. He elected to die in ignominy and torment that we might enjoy eternal life.

If we reflect prayerfully on all this we cannot remain ungrateful. Our hearts are not made of stone. Rather we shall begin to love God. This love will increase if He opens the eyes of our souls and we begin to understand that God desires not only to lavish His gifts on us but also to give, like a true lover, Himself to us as far as He can in the order of providence. St. Francis de Sales with a deep sense of his unworthiness of approaching God said: "I should not want to go to God, if God did not desire to come to me." Now God has anticipated His creature's love: "God has first loved us" (*I John* 4:10). He has taken the first step. By such reflections and by the aid of God, the soul begins to long to give God something

in return for all that God has given to her. The prayer of St. Ignatius comes to her lips.

> Take and receive, O Lord, my liberty,
> Take all my will, my mind, my memory.
> All things I hold and all I own are Thine
> Thine was the gift, to Thee I all resign.
> Do Thou direct and govern all and sway,
> Do what Thou wilt, command and I obey.
> Only Thy grace and love on me bestow,
> Possessing these, all riches I forego.

The soul offers its all to God although she knows full well that God gave it to her and does not need her gifts. She offers everything to God in gladness of heart because she is aware that she will lose nothing thereby. Rather what God accepts from His creatures He guards, increases and perfects for the giver in time and in eternity.

II. GOD OUR COMPANION

The first stage then toward love of God is a deep realization that all that we are and can hope to be is divine benefaction. A more intimate gift and one that should stir us to even deeper gratitude is the thought of God's abiding presence about us and in our souls. The sense of this personal relationship between God and the soul forms one of the principal themes of the Holy Scriptures. "For in Him, we live and move and have our being" (*Acts* 17:28). "God is love, and he who abides in love abides in God and God in him" (*I John* 4:16).

God is present in heaven. Christ our Lord is present in the Holy Eucharist. But God is also present about us and in us. How unaware have we been perhaps of God's nearness to us! If we would love Him, we must seek Him because, although He is ever near us, we can be far from Him. God sees us always, thinks of us always and always cares for us. We do not see God, and, indeed, cannot see Him with bodily eyes. We do not find it easy to think of Him or to trust in Him. Moreover, so many temporal affairs press for our attention that we easily forget God. For this reason the Holy Spirit urges us in Holy Scripture to seek God: "Seek ye God and your soul shall live" (*Ps.* 68:33). "Seek the Lord, seek while He may be found: call upon Him while He is near" (*Isaias* 55:6). "The Lord is with you, because you have been with Him. If you seek Him,

you shall find Him" (*II Para.* 15:2). "Seek His face evermore" (*Ps.* 104:4).

This practice of the presence of God, of seeking God, is more than an exercise of memory. It is memory elevated by grace. Holy men tell us that they have experienced God's presence in various ways. Sometimes the soul is before God as one to whom He is speaking. Again she is as it were with God in darkness: as when we are with a person and light is extinguished and we talk to him without hearing or seeing him and without any bodily contact. Again the soul represents herself in God as a fish in a stream or as a child in the womb of its mother. At other times the soul finds herself, if she shuts her eyes and concentrates all her powers in her interior, close to God conversing with Him in joy and trust. However achieved, this sense of the presence of God is important for prayer and for advance in love. "Convert my heart to Thee, inwardly. Let me abide in Thee; let me see Thee ever present; let me love and revere Thee; let me hear Thy voice; let me lay bare to Thee the miseries of my exile and let me find my consolation in Thee. Never let me lose sight of Thy presence, O light and sweetness of my soul," wrote Venerable Leonard Lessius.

God is of course present to all souls by His omniscience and omnipotence, whether they have been reborn in Christ or not, whether they possess supernatural charity or not; but He is, in a special way, present in the Christian soul which is in the state of sanctifying grace. The divine adoption includes, in addition to grace, charity, and other gifts, the Holy Spirit Himself. God could have justified us without making us His adopted children. He could even have adopted us merely by giving charity and grace and other created gifts. But God who loves the justified soul with predilection wanted to be present in it in a special way. So the Holy Spirit accompanies His gifts and comes personally and substantially to the soul. "Hope does not disappoint, because the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Spirit who has been given to us" (*Rom.* 5:5). Furthermore the Holy Spirit, when He comes to the dwelling of our soul, is accompanied by the Father and the Son. They cannot be separated. The most Holy Trinity, personally and substantially, comes to the justified soul and dwells in it as in a temple. "Do you not know that your members are the temple of the Holy Spirit?" (*I Cor.* 6:19). The soul which realizes this will sing and make melody to the Lord, "giving thanks

always for all things in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (*Eph.* 5:20). Wherever she goes she will, with St. Peter Canisius, urge herself to look upon Him:

> Live inwardly to God, revere His light within;
> Live utterly to God, the world without despise.
> Be all thy thought and anxious care to win,
> Contemning earth, approval from His eyes.

III. GOD OUR HELPER

Gratitude for God's gifts and gratitude for God's abiding presence are stages on the path to the love of God. There is a still more transforming gratitude, however—that which arises from a realization of God's co-operation with us in our lives. No matter what we do, God has to co-operate with us or it could not be done. Without His concurrence we cannot lift a finger in the natural order; on a supernatural plane the divine aid is even more necessary. Men may instruct us but unless God co-operates it will profit us little. Men may speak eloquently but only God can kindle our hearts. Men may declare God's commandments but God aids us in carrying them out. Men water but God gives the increase.

Blessed is the soul that realises that God is a helper in life's tasks, not only in building the temple of holiness in our own souls and in the souls of others but also in all the thousand and one tasks of daily life. Such a realization is a great gift of God which, if prayerfully considered, will lead to a holy familiarity with the Divine Workman and to a deep love. "Behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world" was obviously not addressed to the Apostles alone. As Fr. Charles O'Donnell wrote:

> Once there were two who walked to Emmaus
> Lost in sad converse, sad and very sweet,
> As camest Thou to them, unseeing, thus
> Beside us falls the tread of wounded feet.
> Yet be Thou with us upon every way
> And when death comes, life's Emmaus with us stay.

If we were familiar with God only in prayer, there would be whole areas of our lives from which intimacy with God would be excluded. Remembering God in our other duties can lead us to a higher unity of life. St. Ignatius Loyola taught his companions to seek God while conversing, while walking, while looking, while eating, while listening, while thinking, in short in all their actions.

He was convinced that this method of finding God in all things is easier than abstract considerations and yet wins great divine favors. To quote Fr. O'Donnell again:

> With us, O promised God, Thou art, Thy power
> Availing still to lift our hearts above
> The commonness seen, savoured, touched and heard
> Topping the glamor of all sense, Thy love.

Good desires conceived in prayer are like paths leading to good works. The soul which seeks the Spirit of God in good works as well as in prayer makes more solid progress than the soul which seeks Him in prayer alone. For she who has God both in work and in prayer, has Him in affection and effect. In such a life Martha aids Mary and Mary, while helping Martha, remains, in a real sense, at the feet of Jesus. The soul practises prayer as an incentive to good works and finds in her good works many motives for fervent prayer. Again it is through sweet prayer and not by violent effort that she meets God everywhere.

The soul that realises God's active presence in herself and in others will carry out the counsel to pray always. Formal prayer, it is true, must often be relinquished, but informal prayer will pervade her hours. Some activities require closer attention than others. Some, like study, seem to occupy the whole person. In this latter case the soul will offer its work to God as a prayer and even during absorbing work will sometimes dart a glance of love to God. All can improve their life in Christ. All Catholics are members of His Mystical Body and branches of the sacred vine. Christian life is a life of love for Christ, and a realization of His abiding presence with us will put unity and fervor into all our hours and days.

IV. GOD, SOURCE OF ALL GOOD

A fourth and more elevated stage in the progress of the soul to love is the consideration of God as the source of all good. All the saints were intimately persuaded that all good comes from God. This conviction formed the texture of their minds and hearts and souls and they saw all things in God and God in all things. With Venerable Leonard Lessius they prayed: "Draw my soul to Thee, O boundless beauty! Enchain me to Thee by the eternal fetters of Thy love. For what can I seek or desire outside of Thee who art the plenitude of all good, the source, the end, the sweetness of every good?"

The saint clings to God and so obtains from the fountain of all good an abundant participation of divine favors. Supreme in goodness, God is supremely liberal with His graces and the saints are His masterpieces because they learn not to oppose an obstacle to His munificence. In the sacred liturgy, Holy Mother the Church is ever teaching us to look on God as the origin of good: "O God," she prays, "from whom all good things do come." "O God from whom are holy desires, right counsels and just works." "Almighty and merciful God, of whose gift it cometh that Thy faithful people do unto Thee worthy and laudable service." "Almighty and everlasting God by whose spirit the whole body of the Church is sanctified and governed." The Church points out also that God crowns His gifts in the saints: "O God, the giver of heavenly gifts, who in the angelic youth Aloysius didst unite a wonderful innocence of life with an equal spirit of penance." And she attributes St. Stanislaus Kostka's holiness to a miracle of the divine wisdom: "O God, who amongst the wonders of Thy wisdom dost vouchsafe the grace of mature holiness even to such as are of tender age." All those who read the Missal know that these collects are paralleled by many others.

St. Augustine had caught this spirit when he wrote of his dearly beloved mother, St. Monnica: "I shall not praise my mother but I shall extoll Thy gifts in her." If we realize that "every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of lights" (*James* 1:17), we shall not be jealous of the talents of others or slothful in putting our own to good account.

If we are to be saints we must put all our intentions and actions on a true and solid foundation by recognizing that apart from God we are vile and nothing-worth. We must strive to realize that in God alone is the beginning, middle, and end of all good, and that every reasonable creature must always refer whatever good he perceives in himself or in others to the divine ocean of majesty, power, and perfection.

Considerations such as these may well seem to complicate and obscure something that is very plain and clear. The soul inflamed with holy love wants to say simply to God: "I love Thee." And this brief utterance expresses delight in seeking God and finding Him. The soul rejoices that God is what He is, loves His holy will, His glory, His perfections and longs to possess Him as perfectly as possible. No doubt the more direct the path to divine charity the better

but, however attained, the soul's object must be love without reserve, a love which knows no intermission or relaxation; a love which springs from an undivided heart.

"O Lord Jesus Christ, who hast said: 'Ask and you shall receive; seek, and you shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you,' grant, we beseech Thee, to our supplications the gift of Thy divine love, that in all our words and actions we may ever love Thee with our whole hearts and never cease praising Thee. Amen."

E. A. Ryan, S.J.

Woodstock College
Woodstock, Maryland

Harm Done by Venial Sin

"It has been asked why the majority of religious and devout persons who lead a lukewarm spiritual life make so few acts of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, since, being in the state of grace, they possess them . . . . It is surprising to see so many religious who, after living in the state of grace for forty or fifty years, saying mass daily, and performing all the holy exercises of the religious life, and consequently possessing the gifts of the Holy Ghost in a very high physical degree, corresponding to that sort of perfection in grace which theologians call gradual or a physical increase—it is surprising, I repeat, to see that these religious give no evidence of the gifts of the Holy Ghost in their actions and conduct. Their life is entirely natural, for when blamed or disobliged they show their resentment; they are very eager for praise, esteem, and the applause of the world, and take great pleasure in these things. They love and seek their ease and all that flatters self-love.

"This should not be a subject of amazement, for the venial sins which they commit continually hold the gifts of the Holy Ghost, as it were, bound in such a way that it is not at all surprising that they do not show their effect. It is true that the gifts grow, like charity, habitually and in their physical being; but not actually, and in that perfection which corresponds to the fervor of charity and which increases our merit, because venial sins are opposed to the fervor of charity and consequently hinder the operation of the gifts of the Holy Ghost."

—Father Lallemant, S.J., in *The Spiritual Doctrine,* Part IV, chap. 3, art. 3.

IS "RHYTHM" PER SE ILLICIT?

As a result of the marriage conferences now being conducted in many dioceses, there has been of late a revival of the controversy on the morality of periodic continence, or the use of the so-called "Rhythm Method." Many of the faithful are under the impression that the system has received the unqualified approval of the Church, that it constitutes a form of "Catholic Birth-Control," and may be used without scruple whenever the man and wife so desire. Others have heard that the practice is "objectively unlawful," and may be used only in exceptional circumstances. It is the purpose of this article, not to present the idealism that should motivate Christian marriage, nor to counsel the better and more virtuous mode of conduct in married life, but to cast some light on the morality of periodic continence, that is, on how far, and under what circumstances the adoption of this system involves mortal or venial sin.

The discussion in clerical circles seems in great part to center around the doctoral thesis of Fr. Orville Griese on *The Morality of Periodic Continence,* published in 1942 by The Catholic University of America Press. On p. 18, Fr. Griese asserts that: "The practice of periodic continence according to the 'safe period' method, considered as a system in marital relations, is objectively unlawful,—although it can be justified in individual cases if there is a just case [cause?]. In other words, such a practice, objectively considered, is *per se illicitum, per accidens autem licitum.*" With all due respect to an earnest and valuable piece of work, it is the opinion of the author of this article that Fr. Griese fails to make a few fundamental distinctions, and that, as a result, his assertion is inaccurate, or at least unclear.

By periodic continence is meant the limiting of marital intercourse to those periods of the month that are considered sterile, for the purpose of avoiding conception. Analysis of this system reveals that it involves a number of integrating elements: (1) the use of marriage in the correct and natural way during the sterile periods; (2) temporary or permanent abstinence from marital intercourse during the fertile period; and (3) the intention to employ such a system of marital relations for the purpose of avoiding conception. Each of these elements must be considered in the light of moral principles.

The morality of an action is judged: (1) from the moral object, i.e. the *finis operis,* that to which the action primarily, *per se,* and of its nature tends, as related to the moral law; (2) from the circumstances, i.e. accidental modifications of the morality of an act which is already constituted in its specific morality from the moral object; (3) from the purpose, i.e., the *finis operantis,* that to which the action is directed by the intention of the agent. The purpose is, indeed, a circumstance, but being principal, deserves special mention.

It is important to note that the essential, specific, substantial, or *per se* morality of an action is from its moral object. The circumstances and purpose add only accidental morality. To forestall objections, it is necessary to remark that circumstances can in certain cases change the intrinsic morality of an action, that is, the morality with relation to the natural law. But they can do so only when the natural law is expressed with a condition, by the removal of that condition. For example, the killing of a human being, if unjust, is against the natural law. When the injustice is removed, as in self-defence, the killing is no longer against the natural law. It is more accurate in such cases to say that the application or expression of the natural law is changed, than that the natural law itself is changed. However, the intention of the agent, or *finis operantis,* can never alter the objective morality of a commanded act (*actus imperatus*) or the omission of such an act, because it is extrinsic to the commanded act. Thus, even though a person does an evil act for a good purpose, the act remains wrong from its object.

The morality of periodic continence must, then, be discussed with relation to its moral object, circumstances, and purpose.

THE MORAL OBJECT

Considered with relation to its moral object, apart from all circumstances or purpose, the use of marriage during the sterile times is not wrong. The act is performed in the natural way. Hence, the malice of contraception is not present. It is true that the primary purpose of marriage, which is the procreation of children, cannot be attained. But this is the result of a natural condition; nothing has been positively done to prevent conception. And there are secondary purposes (*fines operis*), such as the fostering of mutual love and the quieting of temptation, to which the act can

be ordered. However, it is not necessary to belabor this point. All theologians agree that the use of marriage during the sterile times is not *per se* illicit.

Nor does it seem that even the permanent abstinence from marital relations during the fertile period is wrong, considered apart from circumstances and purpose. It is important to note that abstinence, or non-use, is not a positive action, but an omission. The morality of an omission is judged with relation to the obligation of the act of which it is the privation. If the act which is omitted is obligatory, the omission of that act is wrong. If the act is not obligatory, the omission of that act is not *per se* wrong. An omission can derive secondary morality from its circumstances or purpose.

All admit that married people are not obliged *per se* to make use of their marriage rights at any particular time. But it may be asked: have they an obligation to make use of their marriage right at least some time during their married life when conception is possible? Apart from special circumstances, it is very difficult to establish any definite obligation on particular married couples to make use of their marriage during the fertile times. Some moralists, in attempting to deduce such an obligation, have appealed to the divine command "to increase and multiply." But this command, as St. Thomas clearly states and as theologians have traditionally taught, induces obligation on the human race in general, but not on particular individuals, even though married. The Church has always praised virginity even in the married state.

Nor does there seem to be any principle by which those who make use of their marriage during the sterile period are by that fact obliged also to use it during the fertile period. The authors who affirm this obligation point out that by the plan of the Creator the pleasure of marriage is ordered to the primary purpose of marriage, and assert that therefore those who enjoy the pleasure of marriage are bound at some time to fulfill the primary purpose of marriage by the procreation of children. However, this consequence does not seem necessarily to follow. The fact that the pleasure attached to the marriage act is ordered in the divine plan to the continuance of the race involves the prohibition to perform the act to which pleasure is attached and at the same time positively to frustrate its primary purpose. But it does not prove an obligation upon one who has rightly used marriage in the sterile time to

use it also during the fertile time. One is always obliged to avoid evil; but one is not always obliged to do good. Only that good is obligatory which is commanded, whose omission would be evil. But there does not seem to be any law, either positive or natural, which states: "if you make use of marriage during the sterile period, you must also use it during the fertile period." It is good and virtuous for married people to have children; but it is difficult to establish an obligation even for those who use their marriage during the sterile period.

It may be asked: for whom is the law of fecundity obligatory, if not for those who, being engaged in the state of marriage, do not renounce the use of the conjugal right for superior motives? The answer seems simply to be: the law of fecundity obliges only the race in general. It does not oblige any individual couples, apart from special circumstances, even those who make use of marriage during the sterile times. It prohibits the frustration of marriage by contraception; but does not place a positive obligation on any individuals.

It has also been asserted that married people have an obligation of having children for the sake of the common good, unless they serve the common good in a higher way by virtuous continence. But again, it does not seem possible to urge such an obligation without taking into account special circumstances. Every individual is bound not to harm the common good; each individual, however, is not obliged to perform all actions that can further the common good, but only those that are commanded by law or that are necessary for the common good, i.e. without which the common good could not be attained. Hence, in the absence of positive precept, as long as the continuance of the race is being sufficiently safeguarded by others, an obligation to have children can scarcely be proved for individual couples. Besides, how can it be determined how many children are necessary for the common good, or how many children each married couple should have? In exceptional circumstances, for instance, if the whole human race or even a particular nation were threatened with extinction or grave evils from a fallen birth-rate, individual couples could have an obligation of having children. But, apart from such circumstances, the offspring of any married couple can hardly be said to be necessary for the common good.

Hence, it seems that the practice of periodic continence is not

per se wrong, i.e. from a consideration of the moral object. Neither the use of marriage during the sterile times, nor even the permanent abstinence from marital intercourse during the fertile time can be proved to be of their nature immoral. However, periodic continence may be wrong either from the circumstances, or from the purpose for which the system is adopted.

THE CIRCUMSTANCES

With regard to the circumstances, the use of periodic continence is wrong:

(1) If both man and wife do not consent, unless a reason is present which would justify one of the partners in refusing the marriage debt during the fertile time. For the refusal of the debt during the fertile time without a just cause is a violation of the marriage contract.

(2) If abstinence during the fertile time brings proximate danger of incontinence which cannot be rendered remote. For it is wrong to place oneself in proximate danger of sin. This danger is very often present, since the use of periodic continence demands no little self-control.

(3) If the use of the system would lead to divorce or a notable lessening of married love. Actually, a large family is one of the greatest guarantees of the permanence of the marriage. The number of divorces, as studies have shown, rises in direct proportion to the smallness of the family.

(4) If not having a family would lead the man or wife to a frivolous life, or other temptations. St. Paul declares that young widows without children (and the same holds true for childless married women), "being idle, learn to go about from house to house, and are not only idle but gossipers as well, and busybodies, mentioning things they ought not" (*I Tim.* 5:13).

(5) If abstinence during the fertile time would cause serious nervous disorders. This point has not received much attention or study; but, since the desire of the wife is said to be strongest during the fertile time, it seems quite possible that the practice of periodic continence might lead to nervous disorders in some women.

(6) Lastly, since the "Rhythm Method" is, according to some experts, only about seventy-five per cent safe, and does not remove all danger of conception, intercourse during the sterile period

would be wrong if circumstances were present which rendered the avoidance of conception obligatory. Hence, if pregnancy would bring certain death to the woman (although this can scarcely ever be asserted with certainty), or if the wife would certainly procure an abortion if she happened to conceive, the use of marriage during the sterile times would ordinarily be wrong.

THE PURPOSE

Apart from these circumstances, it is necessary to investigate whether the practice of periodic continence is wrong from the intention of the agent, or the *finis operantis*. The proximate intention is, as has been mentioned, the avoidance of conception. Is this proximate intention wrong, considered apart from further purposes to which it may be ordered?

The intention to avoid conception would be morally wrong only if conception were obligatory for the couple. For the morality of the elicited act of the will as commanding the acts of the other faculties, or the omission of such acts, is measured by the moral object of the commanded act.[1] If, then, conception is obligatory, the intention to avoid it is wrong; if conception is not obligatory, the intention to avoid it is not wrong. But, as has been shown, neither the use of marriage during the fertile time, nor the begetting of children is, apart from special circumstances, obligatory for particular married couples. Hence, the intention to avoid conception, apart from special circumstances, and as long as nothing is positively done to frustrate the marriage act, is not morally wrong.

However, Fr. Griese asserts that the intention to avoid conception is a positive exclusion of the primary end of marriage. He writes:

> The primary end of sexual union might be excluded either negatively or positively. Negative exclusion means simply that procreation is not realized due to circumstances which are beyond the control of the parties concerned, i.e. those who are physically sterile due to age (past the menopause) or physical defect, or who unintentionally happen to use their marriage right only during the sterile periods. Positive exclusion means that the parties themselves intend to avoid conception. This might be indicated by the express decision: "I intend to avoid conception," or it might be indicated simply by the deliberate

[1] Cf. Aertnys-Damen, 13th ed., I, 50.

placing of an obstacle to conception. This obstacle may be either of a material or of an intentional order,—in both cases there is a deliberate and efficacious attitude "contra conceptionem." In the former case (material contraception) the act is contrary to nature and grievously sinful. An example of positive but intentional exclusion of procreation would be the adopting of periodic continence as a system or policy in marital life, whether it be for many years or only for a period of a few months. It is positive because it proceeds from a free and deliberate decision of the formal element of every human act,—the will.[2]

Again, he declares: "The practice of periodic continence implies a voluntary and deliberate interference with the divine gift of fertility." [3]

These statements are based on a failure to distinguish the two senses in which the word "positive" can be used with relation to human action. A free agent can be positive or negative either with regard to *the willing of an act,* or with regard to *the causation of an effect.* With regard to the willing of an act, moralists distinguish: (1) the *voluntarium negativum* which consists in the privation of a will act when one adverts to the fact that he is bound to act and can act, but omits to do so; (2) the *voluntarium positivum,* which consists in the placing of a will act either to do something (a *volitio*), or not to do something (a *nolitio*). With regard to the causation of an effect, the agent is said to influence the effect positively, or be a positive cause, if the effect flows from an action on his part. He influences the effect negatively, or is a negative cause, if the effect flows from an omission on his part. Thus, if a man who saw another drowning said "I will not save him," he has placed a positive will act, but is only a negative cause of the man's drowning.

Applying the above distinctions, it can be seen that, although married couples who abstain from intercourse during the fertile time will positively not to have children, they exclude or interfere with conception only negatively, i.e. by omitting to place the acts from which conception would follow. It is in this sense that the majority of theologians say that the use of periodic abstinence involves only a negative exclusion of the primary end of marriage. Positive exclusion, by the use of contraceptives, is wrong *per se,* because one is always bound *not to do* what is evil. Negative exclusion, by omitting to place the acts from which conception

[2] *Op. cit.,* pp. 14 f. [3] *Ibid.,* p. 26.

would follow, is not *per se* wrong, because there is not always an obligation to place the acts leading to conception.

The intention to avoid conception, apart from special circumstances, is not wrong. However, this intention is not ultimate, but will always be ordered to a further purpose, which will be either good or bad. Since Thomistic moralists agree that no human act can be indifferent in the concrete, because it will always be directed either to a good or bad ultimate end, so the practice of periodic continence will be morally right or wrong in individual cases according as it is ordered to a good or bad, a virtuous or a selfish end.

Among the *selfish* purposes for which the practice of periodic continence may be adopted can be mentioned:

(1) The inordinate love of pleasure. Either the marriage act can be performed solely for pleasure during the sterile periods, which is morally wrong, or the parties may abstain during the fertile period so as to have opportunity for other pleasures, such as theater-going, night-clubs, vacations, etc. Such an inordinate love of pleasure involves a sin against temperance.

(2) The inordinate love of wealth. Since children often mean that the parents must economize and sacrifice, some married people may avoid procreation for the purpose of acquiring greater wealth, automobiles, houses, etc. It is said that in some cases there is actual deliberation whether to have a new baby or a new car. Inordinate love of wealth is the sin of avarice.

(3) The shunning of the effort required to raise a family. This would be a sin of sloth.

(4) The desire to escape the ordinary pains of child-birth, which would be a sin against fortitude.

(5) The resolution to employ the "Rhythm Method" often proceeds from a habitual attitude of will which prefers one's own private good to the common good, the welfare of the Church, or the glory of God. This attitude is a vice, rather than a sin. It becomes a sin only when expressed in a violation of duty. Actually, it will lead to many sins, either mortal or venial, according to the circumstances and temptations in which the person with this habitual attitude is placed.

Among the *unselfish* purposes for which periodic continence may be practiced are:

(1) The preservation of the life or health of the woman in cases where pregnancy or child-birth would involve a real danger.

(2) The maintaining of reasonable economic security for the family. This reason is not to be admitted too easily. Often the statement that the couple cannot afford another child really means merely that the birth of another child would involve the sacrifice of unnecessary comforts or luxuries. Besides, the care of Divine Providence should not be forgotten. However, there are some cases where the birth of further children would imperil the reasonable economic security of the family, e.g. if the couple already has eight children, and the father earns only forty dollars a week.

(3) To prevent miscarriages or the birth of feebleminded children, if past experiences indicate that such will probably be the result of conception.

(4) To prevent the other partner from using contraceptives.

(5) To avoid the danger of incontinence, if there is a motive rendering it reasonable to avoid conception, but the parties have not the moral strength to abstain from the use of marriage entirely.

Practically, then, when no good purpose is present, the practice of periodic continence will be employed for a selfish purpose, and hence be illicit. However, it is not *per se* illicit from the *finis operis,* but illicit from the intention of the agent, from the *finis operantis.* Fr. Griese's assertion that periodic continence is "objectively unlawful," that it is *per se* illicit, *per accidens* licit, seems to be based on an incorrect, or at least ambiguous use of terms. Nowhere does he define precisely what he means by the terms "objectively unlawful" and *"per se* illicit." Evidently he means these two terms to be taken as synonomous. If his thesis means that the practice of periodic continence is illicit from the moral object, it is incorrect. For considered from the aspect of the moral object, neither the use of marriage during the sterile times, nor the abstinence from marriage during the fertile times is of its nature wrong.

If the thesis means that the use of periodic continence is wrong from the intention of the agent when there is no good purpose present, it is not incorrect, but seems to be poorly worded. It is not incorrect: for, since no human act is indifferent in the concrete, if the system is not adopted for a good purpose, it will be employed for a selfish purpose, and hence be wrong. But to use the terms *"per se* illicit" with such a meaning is not in accord with the common usage of moralists. For the term *per se* is usually

predicated of the morality from the moral object. The intention of the agent does not enter the nature of the commanded act. Hence, one should not say that an act is *per se* illicit because done with an evil intention. It is illicit, not *per se,* i.e. from the moral object, but from the *finis operantis,* which is accidental to the act.

MORTAL OR VENIAL SIN?

From what has been said, it appears that the practice of periodic continence of its nature, or *per se,* involves neither mortal nor venial sin. Moreover, if no evil circumstance is present, and the system is adopted for a good purpose, it can even be virtuous. But if an evil circumstance is present, or the system is used for a selfish purpose, it will be either mortally or venially sinful. Hence:

(1) If "Rhythm" is adopted against the reasonable will of one of the partners, it is mortally sinful, because it implies a grave violation of the marriage contract in the refusal of the debt during the fertile times.

(2) If there is proximate danger of incontinence that cannot be rendered remote, e.g. one of the partners habitually falls into sins of impurity during the fertile times, the use of "Rhythm" is gravely wrong. For it is a serious sin to place oneself in proximate danger of mortal sin, if that danger can be avoided.

(3) If there is real danger that childlessness will lead to divorce, the adopting of periodic continence would ordinarily be seriously wrong. For there would be no good reason for permitting this danger.

(4) If "Rhythm" is followed for selfish purposes, such as the inordinate love of pleasure, or from aversion to the trouble connected with raising a family, the sin involved will be ordinarily venial. For selfishness is a grave sin only when it leads to grave violation of duty. But, apart from special circumstances, the practice does not seem to involve any grave violation of duty. For, as seen, married couples have not *per se* an obligation of procreation.

The well-known responses of the Holy See in 1853 and 1880 seem to confirm the position that the practice of periodic continence is not *per se* illicit, much less *per se* mortally sinful. The Sacred Penitentiary answered on June 16, 1880:

> Married couples who use their marriage rights in the aforesaid manner are not to be disturbed, and the confessor may suggest the

opinion in question, cautiously however, to those married people whom he has tried in vain to dissuade from the detestable crime of onanism.[4]

The Holy See would scarcely have answered thus simply if the practice of periodic continence were *per se* illicit. This answer should be compared with the other response of the Holy See on the *copula dimidiata.* In 1922, the Holy Office wrote to the Bishops of the Netherlands, declaring:

1) That confessors may not of their own accord teach this practice or advise it promiscuously to all penitents who fear the birth of more numerous children; 2) that the confessor is to be reproved who, having tried in vain every other means of dissuading the penitent from the abuse of the marriage right, tells the penitent to have recourse to *copula dimidiata* as a means of avoiding mortal sins; 3) that the confessor is likewise to be reproved who answers to one inquiring about the practice that it is licit without adding any restriction or explanation.[5]

It should be noted that, according to these responses, the confessor is not allowed to suggest the *copula dimidiata* in order to dissuade the penitent from the practice of onanism. But he is allowed cautiously to suggest the use of periodic continence. Why the difference in these two instructions? It is apparently because the *copula dimidiata* contains a deordination, even apart from the intention for which it is used. The act performed *minus apta ad generationem,* is at least venially sinful when complete penetration is possible, and therefore ought not to be counseled in confession. But the practice of periodic continence is not either mortally or venially sinful *per se,* and therefore can be suggested prudently even when complete intercourse is possible.

The fact that periodic continence is not *per se* wrong does not mean that it should be advertised or given unqualified approval. Public, indiscriminate, and apparently approving mention of the practice brings with it the dangers: (1) of scandal, by creating the impression that the Church is promoting sterility, favoring the avoidance of the burdens of married life, giving in to the pagan and pleasure-loving spirit of the age, or trying to find a substitute for contraception; (2) of misuse of the system by those who have no good reason for avoiding conception, but are motivated only by

[4] *Analecta juris pont.,* series 22 (1883), p. 249.

[5] Cf. Aertnys-Damen, 13th ed., II, 594.

selfish considerations; (3) of a decrease in the birth-rate among our Catholic people.

However, in spite of the necessity of caution in mention of the use of periodic continence, it seems that the time will soon be here, if it has not already arrived, when pastors of souls will have to preach publicly against the use of the system for selfish reasons. It is apparently a fact that very few of our Catholic married people, especially in the large cities, have not heard of "Rhythm," so that if they wish to make use of it, they can easily discover the details. On the other hand, many have the impression that its use is not at all wrong, even for those who have no reasons other than selfish for adopting the system.

Though moralists and confessors must know the exact limits where sin begins, yet in preaching and guiding souls in the confessional, the emphasis must always be placed, not on the minimum for avoiding sin, but on the idealism that should inspire Christian marriage, which has been established by the Creator, not for the selfish pleasure of man and woman, but for the great and noble purpose of continuing the human race, of co-operating with God in bringing into existence the spiritual and immortal souls who will love him and find their happiness in Him forever.

HUGH J. O'CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Redemptorist Seminary
Oconomowoc, Wisconsin

THE FAITH AND SECULAR SCIENCE

Legitimate inquiries into the laws of nature are, therefore, no more impeded by the dogmas of faith than our bodily movements are obstructed by the laws of physics. Nay, more, we have the highest ecclesiastical authority for declaring that "not only can faith and reason never be opposed to each other, but that they mutually aid each other; for right reason demonstrates the foundations of faith and, enlightened by its light, cultivates the science of things divine, while faith frees and guards reason from errors and furnishes it with manifold knowledge.

—James Cardinal Gibbons, in *Our Christian Heritage* (Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1889), p. 304.

RATUM NON CONSUMMATUM

Part I

(*The persons and situations portrayed are purely fictional and are used only to illustrate procedure in this type of case*)

The housekeeper met Fr. Brockheim at the door to tell him that a young woman was waiting to see him in the office. Putting the sick-call kit down in its usual place, Father tossed his hat on a hook in the hallway and went into the office.

"Father, the chaplain at the hospital where I work said I should come to see you about my problem."

"Well, now, my child, what is the problem?"

"Well, you see, I'd like to get married again. I've met a nice Catholic boy, and I'd like to marry him."

"And the problem is that you are already married. Is that it?"

"Why, yes, Father. You knew about it! Did the chaplain call you?"

"No, but you said something about getting married again, and there would be no problem if you did not have a husband living."

"That's just it. I was married in the South Pacific while I was in the service. I was a Navy nurse."

"Suppose you tell me the whole story."

It seemed that a flier had been convalescing at the base hospital where the young woman, Alice Brownell, now Mrs. Alice Fairchild, was stationed. The two had become quite attached to each other and as the flier recovered they decided, amid the tensions and uncertainties of the watery war, to be married. It was rather a hasty decision; but they had both felt so certain of their love for each other that they had persuaded the chaplain on the station to perform the ceremony.

Both of the young people were Catholics and, as far as a search could reveal, both were free to marry. The chaplain had, therefore, performed the ceremony. They had planned on ten days' leave together, but, the uncertainties of war being what they were, the honeymoon had lasted only until mid-afternoon when an emergency order had come through cancelling all leaves. The young husband, now completely recovered, had had to report to his carrier which sailed by nightfall.

The young wife, meanwhile, had reported back to the hospital

where a new group of patients was being admitted. With all the fighting and moving about the young couple were unable to arrange another meeting. Letters were infrequent and for months Alice had been frantic, not knowing where her husband of but a few hours was, or even whether he was still alive.

Finally, the letters had ceased completely. Worried sick Alice had tried all channels to obtain information as to the whereabouts of her husband. Eventually she had located him at one of the big land based hospitals state-side and had hastened to visit him there. He was much more badly broken up this time, for he had been hit again in combat. Her heart nearly broke when she saw him, but she tried bravely to paint a rosy picture of what their future would be like once he could leave the hospital and they could be together. With the perverseness, however, which sometimes comes to serious hospital cases he had rejected all that picture and told her that they were through, that she should get a divorce, and that he never wanted to see her again.

Hurt so terribly she had departed and wandered blindly off to lick her wounds in solitude. Money had run short. She had had to go back to work at the only thing she knew, nursing in a civilian hospital now that she was separated from the Navy. For a time, indeed, she had thought that she could never again stand the sight of a patient lying in a hospital bed, for it brought back too vividly the memory of her husband lying there and telling her that he wanted no more of her. She had tried clerking in a store, but, whether because of a lack of skill in that field or because of her emotional condition, she had been unable to make a success of that job and she had finally drifted back to her profession and to her old home town.

For a time work had helped to ease the hurt, but she could not really make herself believe that he had meant that they were all through and that she should get a divorce. After all, she was his wife and she had promised to take him for her lawful husband for better or for worse. If this was the "worse" in that contract, then this was what she had agreed to. She had, therefore, tried again to make him see that she was still ready to stand at his side, to take him home and work to support both of them, if that was necessary.

Still he had rejected her plea, bolstered perhaps by that false pride which makes a man refuse to be dependent. She could see

his point of view, of course, in not wanting to be supported by her when he could not contribute to the maintenance of the family. His pension would have been contribution enough, she had assured him, but that he would not admit. She had also tried to point out to him that they were both Catholics and that divorce was out of the question.

Stubborn still he had threatened that he would commit suicide if she did not get the divorce, for he said that she was too young and pretty to remain tied to an old wreck, a mere fraction of a man, like himself. She should have a real man, a whole man, to look after her and love her. At last she had departed, broken-hearted, since it was too obvious that her presence was serving only to upset him the more, and in his condition he needed all the rest that he could get.

Later, she had received word from the psychiatrist that her visits were doing the patient more harm than good, and that if she really cared for her husband she would not pester him any more with wishes that he return to her. The doctor advised her that the patient would be better off mentally if he could stop worrying about what she would do. Since the husband was so desirous that she get a divorce, the doctor advised her to do so. He added that if she herself did not feel that she should remarry, then that was up to her, but at least the patient would be relieved in mind to know that his wish, which by that time had become almost an obsession, had been granted.

Bewildered and worried Alice had finally started proceedings for a divorce which was granted, although there were no real grounds for it, after the doctors had explained to the judge how much it would mean to the mental health of the patient to know that his wife was no longer bound to a wreck such as he was. "No longer bound to him," Alice repeated with a catch in her voice, as if mere words by a judge could sever the matrimonial bonds.

Sick at heart, she had stumbled from the court-room and had finally made her way somehow back to the solitude of her room to cry her eyes out in despair. At long last the thought had come to her that perhaps work, work, and more work, would at least serve to take her mind off the problem which she had faced so long with waning hopes which had finally been so irretrievably pinched off that day, or was it yesterday, or the day before that, in that cold, stiff court-room.

For two years, now, she had been working long, hard hours. At first, she could hardly bear to have a few moments off duty because there was always waiting for her in the lonesomeness of her room the thought of what she had been through, what she had had and had lost. Time, however, had done its healing work at last and she was able to face the prospect of off-duty hours without fear of being plagued too much by thoughts of the past.

Time alone had not been the sole cause of her change of attitude. There was, in the hospital where she worked, a young doctor, of about her age, who had invited her to attend one of the dances given by the nurses. She had accepted the invitation reluctantly, for she had felt that she could not be a pleasant companion to any man while the memory of her husband was still so sharp within her heart. She had felt, however, that her absence from the dance would be noticed, so she had accepted the invitation. The evening had proved much more enjoyable than she had thought possible.

The doctor was charming and considerate, and her hungry heart had quickly attached itself to someone who seemed ready to show her a little consideration for the first time in years. She had seen more and more of him, all the while telling herself that she could never allow herself to become emotionally involved with him. Gradually, however, they had both discovered that they desired each other very much. This was what her husband had wanted, of course, and it was for this that he had insisted that she get a divorce which would free her from the remnant of a man which he had become. Both she and the doctor, however, were Catholics, and they both realized that to be "married" out of the Church would be utterly wrong.

This, then, was her problem. She had been married by a Catholic chaplain to a Catholic, from whom she was now divorced, and she wanted to marry another Catholic. The doctor, so far as she knew, had never been married, but could anything be done about her status?

Fr. Brockheim pondered a moment, and then asked, "How soon after the ceremony was the groom called back to his carrier?"

"It was very soon. We were married at ten o'clock in the station chapel, and he was called away about three-thirty in the afternoon."

"Did you live together in the meantime?"

"There wasn't time. We had no idea there would be anything to interfere with our ten days' leave, so after the Mass we had a breakfast with a few friends whom we had met on the station. We

stayed at the Officers' Club and had quite a little party, what with our own group, and others stopping by to offer their congratulations. We hardly realized that it was the middle of the afternoon. We rushed off then, to finish our packing for the honeymoon trip, and it was while we were packing that word came that all leaves were cancelled. I was afraid of what that meant, but I still had hopes that we might find a way out, for he had not been discharged from the hospital very long, and I thought maybe that would be an excuse for him not to have to go. I raced to meet Jim as he came out of B.O.Q. where he had been living after he got out of the hospital. I might have known he was too much of a fighter to think of getting out of going. The fact that he was so recently discharged from the hospital meant nothing to him, save that being out of the hospital he was automatically fit to fly. The only thing I could do was go with him to the pier where he boarded the boat which ran him out to his carrier while I stood with the others and waved and tried to smile. After that, we just never seemed able to arrange our leave time so that we could be together. When he was able to get leave it was usually at some distant port while I was on duty at the hospital, and when I could get off he was at sea."

As the young woman sat back and drew a deep breath after that long recital, Fr. Brockheim asked, "Didn't he manage to get leave sometimes at the base where you were stationed?"

"That happened only once."

"Did you live together then?"

"Even then it didn't work out. We went with some of the others on a couple of parties, but I had to report in by eleven. We were shorthanded and the other kids were so overworked that I just could not ask for time off. He didn't seem to mind, really, for some of his old ship-mates from the first carrier he served on were at the base at that time and he had a grand reunion with them."

"How many people knew about this situation?"

"Well, there was my girl-friend, Esther. I roomed with her all the time I was on that station, until she was transferred."

"Was she with you all the time your husband was around?"

"Oh, yes. She was not transferred until after his letters stopped coming. That was another thing which made it so hard. You see, I was frantic wondering what had happened to him that he had stopped writing. I thought he must have been killed or had been shot down and taken prisoner by the Japs. I turned to Esther, and

then, just when I needed her most she was transferred. I never got to feel so close to anyone else in the service. I was pretty well broken up over her departure."

"Where is Esther now?" Fr. Brockheim wanted to know.

"She's married and living on the coast. She married a Navy doctor and she's living at the San Diego base now."

"Have you written her about your plans for a new marriage, if that should be possible?"

"We keep in touch with each other, but I haven't said much about the new fellow. She knows about the divorce, of course. I mentioned Ed to her once and she warned me not to let it get too hot to handle, because after all I am married and divorced and she did not want to see me get involved, as she put it, with something which might get out of hand. I haven't mentioned it to her since it got serious between Ed and me."

"Do you think Esther would be anxious to help you in any way that she could in order that you might marry Ed?"

"She might, if she thought it was possible, but please don't tell her that I have got mixed up with him, because she's an awfully practical and serious person and she'd probably scold me for not using my head and keeping out of trouble. She did do that more than once on the station when she thought I was losing my head over some fellow."

Fr. Brockheim nodded and reached for his pipe. Tamping the tobacco thoughtfully into the bowl he finally said, "Well, now, there will be certain steps which will have to be taken with regard to your case. First, it will be necessary to write a petition to the Holy Father stating all the facts which you have just given me and asking that he grant you a dispensation from the marriage which was ratified, that is to say, contracted, but never consummated. This petition I shall be happy to draw up for you and you can come back day after tomorrow to sign it. Then we shall send it to the Bishop who will see that it is transmitted to Rome."

"Oh, thank you, Father. Do you really think there is some hope for me to get free so that I can marry Ed?"

"I never like to raise a person's hopes in matters such as these, my child, because I've seen too many cases which looked good fail for want of sufficient and proper evidence. All that I will say to you at this time is that we shall take all the steps which are necessary and proper to present your case in its true light to the

Holy Father, so that if, in his judgment, the facts warrant it he may grant you a dispensation from your previous vows of marriage in order that you may marry Ed."

"You mean they will annul my marriage to Jim?"

"No. I mean that the marriage to Jim is good, so far as we can see, and what will happen will be, not a pronouncement that your marriage to Jim was never any good, but that you are dispensed, that is to say, freed, from those vows so that you can contract a new marriage in the Church with Ed."

"You mean I was married to Jim and now I can be dispensed from that marriage so that I can marry Ed?"

"If an investigation of the facts shows that you merely went through a marriage ceremony, but did not thereafter live with Jim as man and wife and that there is sufficient reason for the granting of the dispensation you can be released from those previous vows."

"Is this something new in the Church?"

"Oh, no. It has been going on for centuries. The rules of procedure which we now follow in this type of case were promulgated by the Sacred Congregation on the regulation of the Sacraments back in 1923, but the idea is much older than that." [1]

After the young woman had left, Fr. Brockheim got out his copy of the rules to be observed in processes regarding a marriage which has been ratified, i.e. contracted, but never consummated. Just as he had explained to the young woman, the rules required that such cases be submitted to the Sacred Congregation on the regulation of the Sacraments. It was the only agency which could consider the facts whether or not a marriage was not consummated and whether or not there existed a just reason for granting the dispensation.[2]

No judge of any lower court could start a case leading to a dispensation from a marriage contracted, unless the Apostolic See had previously given him the faculty to do so.[3]

The Congregation recognized, of course, that it was not imposposible that a case might be started in which a declaration was sought that the marriage apparently contracted was really null and void from the beginning because one or the other of the

[1] *Regulae Servandae in Processibus super Matrimonio Rato et Non Consummato,* S. C. Sacr., 7 May, 1923, *AAS* XV, 392.

[2] Cf. Art. 1; Can. 249, §3, 1962.

[3] Cf. Art. 2; Can. 1963, § 1.

parties was impotent and hence incapable, under the natural law, of contracting a valid marriage. The proofs in such a case might not suffice to establish clearly the fact of impotence, but they might suffice to show that the marriage was at least never consummated.

In such a case the judge of the diocesan tribunal was entirely within the field of his competence, as far as the subject-matter was concerned, when he began to hear the case which was introduced on the grounds of impotence. It would be a loss of time and effort to start the whole case over again for a dispensation from a marriage contracted but never consummated, were one to insist that as to those proofs the judge had never been competent to hear them since he had not been previously given faculties to hear such a case by the Holy See.

In practice, therefore, when such a situation developed, the judge was simply to forward to the Congregation the entire record of what had occurred before him, together with a petition in the usual form, signed by one or both of the parties. This petition would ask for the dispensation. The Congregation could then make use of the record already obtained to give its decision with regard to whether the marriage was really never consummated after being contracted. Thus a saving of time and effort as well as of expense could be had.[4]

If the fact of non-consummation began to appear before the record was complete it would again be a waste of time to send the record in immediately to the Congregation, which would only have to write back to have it completed. Consequently, when such a situation developed the record was to be completed by the judge of the diocesan court, even though, technically, he might seem not to be authorized to proceed with regard to such matters. The authorization, of course, was to be found in Article 3, § 2 of the Rules which prescribed that he do just that.

Likewise, if a case was being heard, whether in the trial court or in the court of appeal, to determine whether a marriage was null and void from the beginning because of some other alleged grounds of nullity, e.g. lack of consent, force and fear, etc., and the fact of nullity was not clearly proved; but, as a side issue, a very probable doubt emerged whether the marriage was ever consummated, then either party or both parties could present a petition

[4] Cf. Art. 3, § 1; Can. 1963, § 2.

to the Holy Father, seeking a dispensation from a marriage ratified but never consummated.[5]

In such cases, too, it was not necessary to wait while the petition was sent to Rome and faculties were sent back to the judge of the diocesan court. In virtue of the concession in Article 4 of the Rules, the judge in such cases had the power, by delegation of law, to hear the case according to the Rules laid down in 1923 and then to transmit the record to the Congregation for decision.

In the case, therefore, of Mrs. Alice Fairchild which was to be presented as an ordinary case seeking a dispensation from a marraige contracted but never consummated, Fr. Brockheim began to prepare a petition which she could sign. She would have to sign it, for only parties to the marriage had a right to seek a dispensation from a marriage contracted but never consummated.[6]

The peculiar nature of this type of case was indicated by the fact that in the petition Mrs. Fairchild was described, not as "plaintiff," but as "petitioner," while Jim Fairchild could be described, not as "defendant," but only as "respondent." After all, this was not a case of the usual type in courts where the two parties oppose each other, seeking to win a decision from the judge; but was an attempt to obtain a favor from higher authorities, who might or might not be inclined to accede to their prayers, according to the way the proofs turned out. Of course, since Jim apparently wanted the same thing as Alice in the present case, he could hardly be called even "respondent." His position was rather that of "co-petitioner."[7]

The petition, as is customary in these cases, was addressed to the Holy Father and was to be sent to the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments. It was to contain a full and accurate statement of the facts of the case together with all the reasons, which might lead to the granting of the dispensation. It was to be dated, and to contain an indication of the diocese in which the petitioner resided.[8]

Special care was to be taken that the petition should give a true and genuine exposition of the facts, written if possible by the party herself, and at least subscribed by her.[9] Having had considerable experience with such petitions when drawn up by the parties,

[5] Cf. Art. 4.
[6] Cf. Art. 5, § 1; Can. 1973.
[7] Cf. Art. 5, § 2.
[8] Cf. Art. 6, § 1.
[9] Cf. Art. 6, § 2.

Fr. Brockheim, to avoid an excessive use later of the blue pencil to cut out irrelevancies which would simply becloud the issue, drew up the petition for Alice himself, according to the notes which he had taken in the course of his conversation with her. He preserved the tone and flavor of her oral statements as much as possible, for it was, after all, her petition; but he eliminated the irrelevancies with which her story had been interwoven.

The petition, then, which he had ready when Mrs. Fairchild returned at the appointed time, was addressed to the Holy Father, and opened with her name, stating that she was the daughter of Frank and Mary Brownell, that she lived in the Diocese of X, in the city of Walton. It gave her age and the fact that she was by profession a nurse, residing at 420 Rich Street in St. John's parish. It said that humbly prostrate at the feet of His Holiness she was setting forth the following facts.

The facts he recited tersely, but with enough detail to enable the Congregation to determine whether or not the petition seemed to merit the granting of faculties to a local judge who could hold hearings and transmit the record to Rome.

He started with a statement about the marriage itself. He told when it was contracted, with whom, how old the petitioner was at that time, and where it took place. He then added, point by point, the matters which had developed in the course of his conversation with Alice Fairchild. The final paragraph contained the reasons for seeking the dispensation, viz., 1) that the other party absolutely refused to have anything more to do with the petitioner so that there was no longer any hope of reconciliation; 2) the dangers inherent in her being forced to remain unprotected at her age; 3) her desire to contract a new marriage, the possibility of which was now offered to her.

In drafting the petition Fr. Brockheim made use of the specimen form conveniently published in the appendix to the Rules. The general outlines of his petition were taken directly from that specimen; but, of course, the statement of facts was peculiar to the case of Alice Brownell Fairchild.

Any member of the Church is, of course, always free at any time to write to the Holy Father, but in cases such as these it was considered preferable to have the petition transmitted through the local Bishop, who was supposed to add his own information so that the Congregation, forced to operate at such a distance, might have a

clearer picture of the situation.[10] Fr. Brockheim, therefore, took the petition down to the Chancery Office the next time he went there, to explain the case to the officials in the office so that the Bishop might know what it was all about when he came to give his report to the Congregation on this case.

The Bishop asked Fr. Brockheim whether he was the proper one to transmit this petition, since the hospital in which Jim Fairchild was still a patient happened to be in another diocese. He was, furthermore, not the bishop of the diocese in which the marriage had been contracted. Neither because of the place of contract nor because of residence of the respondent was he competent to transmit the petition. Though it appeared that the woman in the case was divorced civilly, and permission had been obtained for that civil separation, so that she might be arguably considered lawfully separated from her husband and thus entitled to present her petition through his Chancery, still he thought it would be better to have the matter presented from the diocese in which the man resided.[11]

Fr. Brockheim pointed out, in response, that according to Article 8, § 2 of the Rules it was permitted that the petitioner have recourse to the Holy See through the Bishop of the place in which he or she actually resided, and that this Bishop could receive and recommend the petition to the Sacred Congregation, especially when many of the witnesses to be heard resided in his diocese. Alice Brownell Fairchild had been born and raised in the diocese, and while a very important witness, the nurse who had been her room-mate and intimate friend at the time of the marriage, lived now in San Diego, still, most of the witnesses who would have to testify as to her character and reputation for truthfulness were people residing in the diocese.

This greater ease of getting testimony if the case were principally heard in his diocese, together with the fact that Alice Brownell Fairchild had had permission to separate civilly from her husband persuaded the Bishop, finally, to add his *Commendo preces* with his signature, to the petition.

Before the petition could be sent, however, it was necessary for the Bishop to investigate so that he might inform the Congregation with regard to the case. He proceeded, therefore, to write to Alice Fairchild's pastor in St. John's parish, and to the chaplain at the

[10] Cf. Art. 7.

[11] Cf. Art. 8, § 1.

the hospital where Jim Fairchild was a patient, to obtain information as to the case and as to the possibility of a reconciliation. This was not by way of questioning the parties or witnesses, for as yet he was not authorized by the Holy See to proceed with such questioning. Rather it was an approach to men who should have some sort of idea of the situation and who could give their opinion as to the story she told and as to the possibility of reconciliation.[12]

Were Alice Fairchild a non-Catholic the Bishop was similarly authorized to transmit the petition to the Sacred Congregation, giving the explanations which might be opportune or necessary with regard to the foundation of the petition, the personal qualities of the petitioner, and other pertinent circumstances.[13]

The Church, always desirous of protecting the Sacrament of Matrimony, instructed the Bishop that when he had a sufficient knowledge of the facts and of the persons involved he should attempt to reconcile the parties to each other in order that their marital life might not be broken up, using the offices of prudence and pastoral charity and the arguments which seemed most opportune in the particular case, unless from his knowledge of the persons involved and the circumstances he should be convinced that such procedure was entirely useless.[14] This was the reason for his request for information from the pastor and the chaplain as to the possibility of reconciliation. In the actual case, of course, in view of Jim's feelings in the matter, an attempt at reconciliation was practically foredoomed to failure, but there was always the possibility that he had subsequently changed his mind.

This obligation to attempt to reconcile the parties was not placed on the Bishop alone. The pastors of the parties were also bound to try, when they obtained knowledge of discord and difficulty in marital life, to offer timely counsel and exhortations, as prudence might indicate in each case, lest the way be opened for the breaking up of conjugal life.[15]

From the statement of facts it was apparent that the marriage had not been consummated because of lack of time and opportunity, rather than because the parties had been practicing contraception. Had this latter been the case, then the petitioner, or both of them,

[12] Cf. Art. 9, § 1.
[13] Cf. Art. 9, § 2.
[14] Cf. Art. 10, § 1.
[15] Cf. Art. 10, § 2.

if both were co-petitioners, would have had to be advised that the case could not be heard nor carried further.[16]

The innocent party to the practice of contraception might still be heard, whether that party had never consented to the practice or having formerly consented had undergone a change of heart and sincerely promised that married to another he or she would abstain from such practices in the future. It would, of course, be necessary to show also that restoration of the previous marital life was now impossible.[17]

Should the Sacred Congregation, after examining the petition and the information obtained from the Bishop, decide that the prayers of the petitioner should be heard, it would, if it followed its usual practice, delegate the Bishop who had signed the *Commendo preces* to proceed to hear the proofs in the case, make up the record, and transmit that record to the Congregation. In the sessions in which the proofs were heard the Bishop would follow the Rules of 1923 and any other instructions which might be given him.[18]

(To be continued)

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[16] Cf. Art. 11, § 1. [17] Cf. Art. 11, § 2. [18] Cf. Art. 12.

THE SOUL OF THE APOSTOLATE

It would be a grave error fraught with many dangers should the priest, carried away by false zeal, neglect his own sanctification, and become over-immersed in the external works, however holy, of the priestly ministry. Thereby, he would run a double risk. In the first place he endangers his own eternal salvation, as the great Apostle of the Gentiles feared for himself: "But I chastise my body, and bring it into subjection: lest perhaps, when I have preached to others, I myself should become a cast-away." In the second place he might lose, if not divine grace, certainly that unction of the Holy Spirit which gives such a marvellous force and efficacy to the external apostolate.

—Pope Pius XI, in the Encyclical *Ad catholici sacerdotii*", issued Dec. 20, 1935.

A NEED AND A REMEDY

"Put philosophy and theology in the course of studies," Bishop John K. Mussio of Steubenville advised the Association of American Colleges at their annual meeting last January. It was a revolutionary suggestion, but plain common sense if lethal errors are to be purged from American life.

Whether or not the Bishop's proposal is put into action depends on the seven hundred college presidents and educators attending that convention in Cincinnati, Ohio. But while waiting for them to act, there is something the rank and file of us can do to insure the success of his plan.

Before that change in curricula can effectively be made, philosophical and theological textbooks must be available, plus a whole subsidiary related-reading literature that can be easily assimilated by the digest mentality of students today. For even if the A. A. C. should decide to put philosophy and theology into the curricula of the nation's schools tomorrow, to find suitable books in modern idiom would be embarrassingly difficult.

Pope Pius XII has noticed the need. Speaking in audience with some Jesuits on the occasion of the Tercentenary Celebration of the martyrdom of Saint Isaac Jogues, His Holiness admonished, "Men of doctrine should so express themselves that the *men of our time will understand and listen to them.*"

One remedy for this situation (there seems to be no other) would be for many more priests to put in writing what they know so well from their seminary training and ministerial experience. They could either express their own ideas, or interpret the great theological masters in a less technical style, so that young minds of our day would be attracted to truth, and grasp it with clarity equal to its importance. No one is better equipped than a priest, with his grounding in philosophy and theology, to write books, pamphlets, magazine articles, and even "fillers," which would provide that Catholic literature necessary if Bishop Mussio's proposal is to be realized with any degree of success. Consider for a moment the training a priest receives, the information he possesses, the strong incentive he has for writing.

Someone may object, "Have not St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, Francis Suarez, and a dozen other reputable authors

written enough on theology to supply the current need?" Apart from the implication in the Pope's words, a priest's own experience with those ancient writers is enough to show that they—as they stand—are not sufficient.

What college boy today "understands and listens to" Suarez? Only the exceptional reader will be patient enough to chew through his customary prefatory paragraphs before getting to the meat of a problem.

What college girl will persevere in reading Augustine's diffuse treatises? Surely a more efficient style today would be something resembling the newswriter's style. Every theological treatise could be headlined with a concise statement of the truth to be learned. That "lead" would be straightway followed by the usual "who-where-when-what-why-how" in the order of their importance.

Such a translation of theology into modern idiom and format seems to be the only realistic procedure nowadays when a writer must be arresting if he is to be read, and often concrete if he is to be understood. If you have ever dreamt of a world in which the substantial truth taught by an Augustine or Beraza was as readable, for example, as the transient incidentals in *Time Magazine,* you have dreamt of what the Pope means when he urges men of doctrine to express themselves in such fashion that men of our time will understand and listen to them.

Can the Pope's dream come true in the format of a Saint Thomas? The Angelic Doctor's style, to be sure, approximates modern journalistic method more closely than Augustine's, inasmuch as he puts main issues briefly at the start of each section, and divides his subject matter into definite divisions. But there is a prolixity in him also that ordinarily disconcerts the reader today, and as a consequence deters further reading.

An example of something closer to the Pope's desire is found in the works of Msgr. Matthias Joseph Scheeben, for that author at least anticipated a more heterogeneous circle of readers than the preceding authors. Msgr. Scheeben's aim, stated in his preface, practically paraphrases the Pontiff's own words:

> I cherish the deep conviction that speculative theology is of supreme importance for the truest and highest formation of mind and heart, and that under the guidance of the great doctors of the Church secure roads must be built, reaching to the very summits of divine

truth, *roads that can be traveled without excessive hardship not only by a few privileged spirits, but by anyone* who combines courage and energy with a sufficiently sound education.[1]

Bishop Mussio's proposal, together with the words of the Pope, present an urgent invitation to modern theologians to develop a sense of communication with the modern mind, and to put what they have to say *in writing*. For whereas a priest's spoken word can reach hundreds, and perhaps thousands by radio, his written word can reach hundreds of thousands—and for years to come.

Some of the clergy, it is true, may feel entirely incapable of producing textbooks such as Bishop Mussio's plan requires. But this should not stop them from contributing their stint to the bulk of subsidiary literature likewise required. The need for Catholic literature is serious enough for *every* priest to try producing at least *one* representative expression of that truth to which he has dedicated his life. Who does not know of priests who possess fine powers of thought and expression yet never utilize them in print? Each man, of course, must be the judge of his own case, for only he knows the circumstances preventing him. Nevertheless it is also true that every priest who has the power and opportunity to write, should do his utmost with his typewriter for the glory of God and the good of souls. None should shy away from publication because of a false humility. For as a matter of fact, his humility will grow in proportion to his efforts at publication. No one knows his own limitations until he tries to put the ineffable on paper.

An experienced priest-author has outlined a simple *modus agendi*, which will almost certainly result in the enrichment of current Catholic literature. It is advisable, he says, to devote some time—say, half an hour—every day to writing. The sum total of such effort at the end of a year will be quite surprising. For if each day he fills a typewritten sheet double-spaced (say, 340 words per day), on December 31 he will have written over 120,000 words. A fair-size book contains only 42,000 words. Hence this page a day would result in a yearly output of about three books of average size. Similarly, if the priest could average only two or three typewritten pages every week, he could readily write at least one book in the course of a year. (These figures are given not to encourage writing

[1] *The Mysteries of Christianity*, translated by Cyril Vollert, S.J. (St. Louis: Herder, 1946), "Translator's Preface," p. v.

of many books a year, but rather to show how a little daily effort will mount up in the course of a comparatively short time.) [2]

Almost any news item in any diocesan newspaper explains why every priest should try to become an apostle of the printed word. It may even give him a specific point of departure for a magazine article or book. For example:

(1) The reported speech of Rev. Edward V. Stanford, Prior of the Augustinian college in Washington:

> There is at present in the United States a misguided minority who have unreasoning fear of the Catholic Church, and who misread into all her beneficent works a desire for national domination, especially in matters of education and morals. . . . Information and more information is required to correct such misinformation and to allay misunderstanding even among people of good will.[3]

There is a call for any amount of exposition of Catholic doctrine, the *De ecclesia* treatise in particular.

(2) U. S. Occupation Forces in Japan have all but forced on the schools there a history textbook attacking the divinity of Christ and teaching atheistic evolution. The new *History of the West* tells Japanese students that:

(a) Today none of us can believe in such stories as the Gospel tells about the birth of Jesus, His miracles or His resurrection.
(b) The human mind has been continually progressing toward emancipation from superstition, that is, religion.
(c) Early Christians in Rome were persecuted because they were intolerant, held secret meetings, and were regarded as a menace to the state.
(d) Christianity succeeded because of political alliances between the popes and the Roman Emperors.
(e) The Council of Nicea was a victory of the Athanasian sect over the Arians with the help of political pressure.
(f) The Middle Ages, aside from a few artistic and scholastic attainments, was a time of intellectual darkness, from which mankind was rescued by the Reformation and Renaissance.
(g) Men at last are now able to see through the deceptions of the priests who for long prevented knowledge and learning in the name of their God.[4]

[2] Cf. *The Priest,* by Edward F. Garesché, (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1930), pp. 209 ff., 311 f.

[3] *The Catholic Chronicle,* January, 1948.

[4] *Ibid.*

What a deluge of Catholic truth is needed here to offset—and, if possible, correct—these blatant errors! What a great deal of good could be done by a short article (drawn from your ecclesiastical history notes) on each of those lies!

(3) In Boston more than 80,000 Massachusetts voters have signed a petition circulated by the Planned Parenthooders of Massachusetts asking the state legislature to amend the state law of 1879, which forbids physicians to advise the use of mechanical and chemical gadgets to circumvent the purpose of marriage. The petition is worded so that the amendment is represented as "permitting physicians to give birth control advice to married women for the protection of life and health." There is a good springboard for many articles on the morality of birth control and the Sacrament of Marriage.

So do diocesan and secular newspapers tell week after week what dangerous misinformation daily drifts into the minds of our own parishioners. A priest could find in every daily paper reason enough for at least one magazine article which would interpret the wonderful theology that he has stored away in the less accessible recesses of his mind.

It is beginning to sound monotonous, but still true, that more than ever before, Catholics live in a world in which many do not share their beliefs. Accordingly, more than ever before, the clergy must bring their philosophical and theological knowledge to bear on world problems. How well the clergy knows that political, social, and economical harmony are impossible without theological truth! The clergy, therefore, must proclaim the immense meaning of the deaths of the first Christian martyrs; explain why the Church cannot make the slightest compromise or permit the least equivocation in her dogmas; narrate, in short, the epic of Catholic intransigence. To do all this effectively *today,* the clergy must do it in *writing.*

The case summarily stated is this: college curricula need a strong dose of sound philosophy and theology, administered by way of books readily intelligible to modern students. For sustained results, these textbooks must be then supplemented by a more varied supply of less technical literature. Both of these apostolic remedies must, in the main, be supplied by the clergy, by reason of its training and boundless experience. *"Men do not light a lamp*

and put it under a measure, but upon a lamp-stand, so to give light to all."[5]

THOMAS TRESE, S.J.

West Baden College
West Baden Springs, Indiana

[5] *Matt.* 5:15.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the November, 1898, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* the leading article by Dom Mackey, O.S.B., is entitled "St. Francis de Sales and the Formation of the Clergy." It is an interesting account of the methods employed by the saintly Bishop of Geneva to raise the intellectual and spiritual standards of the clergy by the establishment of colleges, the holding of synods, individual attention to his priests, etc. It is interesting to note that one who was famed for gentleness of disposition "was inexorable against those who stained the priestly character by immoral conduct". . . . Writing on "A New Method of Teaching History," Fr. H. T. Henry discusses an article in the *Educational Review* advocating the use by students of original sources instead of the standard text-books. Fr. Henry does not favor this method for the ordinary course of history, but he recommends that the text-books in common use be revised in accordance with the most reliable sources. . . . . Fr. A. Goodwin suggests a greater use of the Bible in the religious instruction of children. . . . An anonymous pastor from South Dakota writes inspiringly of the development of priestly vocations among the boys and young men of his flock. His own method is to have them work about the church and rectory, helping in ceremonies as well as in manual labor, until they are prepared for seminary or college. He adds: "Of the students who have been with me (in the course of thirty years) nine thus far have become zealous priests, others are well on the way, and there are several who are anxiously waiting to be taken". . . . This issue contains the apostolic letter of Pope Leo XIII, issued on Dec. 30, 1892, confirming the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus which prescribe fidelity to the doctrine of St. Thomas. . . . Among the books listed as having been put on the Roman Index is one entitled "Monks and Their Decline" by an American priest.

F.J.C.

THE PRIEST IN RADIO

Part II

The Radio Talk

Radio producers are pretty generally agreed that the hardest programs to put on the air are "talk programs." The reasons for this are not hard to see when you think of the notions that were brought out in Part I of this article. People don't want to be educated by radio. They can be, but they have a subtle resentment against it. The talk program is "education" to the great radio audience, and so if a speaker wants to be heeded, he has to have something to say, and he must know how to say it.

That Catholics have something to say, none of my readers will deny. We have the truth about God, about life, about ethics and morality—in fact about the things that make people live the lives they should. Our message to the world is not some private idea about the good life; it is God's idea about the good life.

Radio can help us reach millions of people with that message. That is why it is the most important publicity medium in the world. That is why Catholics must use it, but we must use it the way it was designed to be used.

Now most radio programs on which priests appear are talk programs. And many times, it is felt that, especially if time is short, it is all right to polish up an old sermon and give that. This, of course, is a very bad idea. The radio talk is not a pulpit sermon. If it is, then it is not a good radio talk.

The talk, I think, is going to be with us a long while on religious programs, despite what some modern critics say. The reason is that the audience looks upon religion as being associated with talks. St. Paul said that "faith cometh by hearing," and our traditional way of hearing religious truths is by talks or sermons. The great radio audience is affected emotionally by dramas, it is true, and drama can be a very effective way to present even religious truths and affect the listener. But in my opinion radio drama is not yet the surest way of presenting religious truth nor the most effcetive.

For one thing, the general listener, as I said, expects a religious program to be somewhat in the style of a church service. And yet, he doesn't want to be "preached at." But still he wants his religious program to be "religious." By this he means it should have a certain

character of worship about it—a certain character of solemnity, but without being pompous.

Now we have pointed out that the priest has all the technical equipment to produce a talk like this. He has the background, the training, the experience, the necessary tools. But there are also pitfalls that he must watch.

He can indulge in flights of oratory and poetic fancy that nobody but the initiates will understand. He can use words for the sake of words—purple patches, as Horace calls them. They add very little and usually detract from the talk, for the simple reason that no one will know what the speaker is driving at.

He can indulge in a display of learning that is meaningless to the audience. For instance, it may "dress up" a sermon for a congregation that prides itself on its intellectuality to speak of "the real immanent differentiation of the divine," or to discuss the question of the nature of the matter and form of the sacraments. But the average man in the radio audience isn't interested in those fine words any more than he would be thrilled by a discussion of the Thomistic concept of hylemorphism in its relationship to modern science. He might like to know something about atomic energy and whether or not there is something in St. Thomas that coincides with modern scientific speculation, but he wants it in terms he can understand. The presentation has to be accurate but simple. If, as some specialists say, you can't be accurate and simple about some subjects, then one may rest assured that they aren't subjects for radio talks.

Probably, of course, what is required for the treatment of some subjects is the type of mind of St. Albert the Great. He is said to have been able to express the most metaphysical of concepts so simply that a child listening would cry out: "Video."

Perhaps the simplest way to put the matter, then, is to say that if any given speaker feels he can't treat a subject without getting technical about it, he oughtn't to treat that subject—at least on the radio.

There is even a possibility that some people are such experts on certain subjects, and they live on such an abstract plane all the time, that they are not good radio timber for speaking on their own most precious field of endeavor. I am sure, for instance, that Dr. Einstein would find it most difficult, if not impossible, to clarify for the radio audience his theory of relativity. He would probably

feel happy in speaking to mathematicians like himself who would grasp his meaning without any simplification.

It is not the technically learned that the radio speaker must reach, but ordinary people. To reach them he must use language they understand. And he must present concepts that they understand. That is why, I think, the new Code of the National Association of Broadcasters says that religious programs ought to stick to "broad religious truths." This doesn't mean that a Catholic speaker is to water down Catholic doctrine, or to gloss over its real meaning just to make it palatable to a lot of people who have been affected by heresy, or who are such indifferentists that they think "one religion is as good as another." Undoubtedly, a lot of people do think that, and the Catholic speaker must disabuse them of that notion whenever he can.

Instructions

This leads me to another point—the question of giving religious instructions over the air. There are many who think that if radio is to be really effective for the Church, it should be a medium whereby a priest could give convert instructions. This means, as I have gathered from certain people, that a priest should be able to give a "course of instructions" on the Catholic faith such as he would give in his rectory or to a group of potential Catholics. That is, he should be able to go into the finer ramifications of Catholic dogma, and explain them.

We come back now, in examining this problem, to the question of the audience. We pointed out that the audience consists of people of all sorts of backgrounds. It consists of people you can't see and "feel out" as it were, so it would seem futile to go into a long, careful discussion of the problem of how Christ is present in the Holy Eucharist. The main thing to point out in the radio talk is that He *is* present there. If any of our separated brethren are interested, and some of them will be, then is the time to make personal contact with them and explain as well as possible how that presence comes about. As to following up interested persons, I shall say more later.

The main thing, then, that the radio program can and should do, is to stimulate interest in the Church, to disabuse people of false notions about her teachings, and to encourage further inquiry about

the Church. You can't give the whole picture in one radio talk, although I have come across people who have tried to do just that.

We'll think now, for a moment, what subjects ought to be treated in the talk. Obviously, you can't give all the background on any one subject—the theological explanation of the Holy Eucharist, for instance, is expressed in the Scholastic terminology of substance and accidents, and you can't give a complete explanation of that in fifteen minutes.

The most effective talks are those which start out with a problem or a happening the listener is familiar with. Most people today are beset by problems—financial, matrimonial, and so on. Most listeners are bewildered over the news in the daily papers about the atom bomb, the political situation in the world, and many other questions.

These are the things that worry them. They are not directly worried about their relationship to God, even though actually that is the source of their problems. Once they would get that relationship clear in their own minds, the other problems would fall into perspective or maybe not even be problems at all any more.

So it is the radio speaker's business to tie into one of these problems and show how the Catholic Church can answer it. Much of the talk might be on very mundane problems—family life, how to get on with in-laws, and so on—but always answered in terms of Catholic thought and philosophy. If, in any of these talks, the speaker can tie in the notion of the Blessed Sacrament, Baptism, or some other religious truth, to show its effects on life, so much the better.

Choice of Words

Since he is speaking to the kind of audience we have described, the radio preacher will have to be careful in his choice of words. As we mentioned before, he should eschew technical terms. He should also try to use words that paint a picture rather than use words that are cold and dull.

There is an idea expressed in most books on radio drama that says that in setting a scene one must remember that the listener cannot see it. He can only hear it. Therefore, if one is setting a scene in a man's living room, one should have the dialogue express that fact, something like this:

Voice 1. "Here, Joe, come over by the fire and take that armchair—the big red one. I think you'll find that comfortable."

(Not: "Here, Joe, sit down.")

You see the difference. In the first case, some picture is painted by words—words that the listener can understand and that have an impact upon his imagination. In the latter case, nobody knows what kind of chair Joe is asked to sit in, or what kind of room he's in in the first place.

I have seen radio scripts which have the "business" outlined in such a way that no one but the writer or producer knows what is meant. This kind of script might have some such cue written in like this:

"Joe goes to the fire and sits in a red armchair."

You see, it's all clear in the writer's mind, but how is the audience able to get the sound of Joe sitting in a red arm-chair?

Now, *pari passu,* the same thing is true of the talk. One must use the colorful word rather than the drab one. One must use the descriptive adjective rather than the meaningless one.

Let's take this example.

It might perhaps, in some circles, be considered a fine flight of oratory to say: "And then the man walked with great celerity down the corridor, in which there was no illumination."

Why not more simply say: "Then the man hurried down the dark hall"?

I'll admit these examples are extreme, but they show what I mean.

The same thing is true of the expression of the abstract. Now many religious truths are abstractly phrased—"We must do good and avoid evil": "God is omnipotent," and so on. How express them?

Usually, the best way is by examples and analogies. But first of all, the verbiage has to be simplified. Surely the radio audience will have some trouble getting the idea of "omnipotence." If, however, the speaker says that "God can do anything," he is getting close to the truth, and close to what his listeners can understand. (It is true he may have to clarify the thought by saying that God cannot do things which are really not things at all, like making a square circle.)

I think the trouble with most radio speakers is that they try to achieve simplicity by using deceptively simple terms—what Alice in Wonderland calls "portmanteau" words. They don't like to explain ideas. They'd rather use a sort of technical short-hand

known to the initiates than expand the idea. On the other hand, there is a tendency to use a lot of words for a presumed oratorical effect, as in the case of the man walking down the dark corridor.

The truth lies somewhere in between; expand ideas and keep mere verbiage to a minimum.

Length

Now comes the question of how long the radio talk ought to be.

There are many speakers who feel that they can talk as long as they want, or as long as they are accustomed to talk in the pulpit.

I can only point out the following facts. One of them has been pointed out before, and that is that the radio operates on split-second timing. This is especially true of network programs.

So one might say that, therefore, there is a certain time limit beyond which nobody can go on the radio. Otherwise one will get "clipped." This of course is not always true on programs on local stations. I have been in control rooms where a run-over of a minute or two was considered as nothing. But it seems to me that if a speaker is speaking on a local station he ought to try to be as accurate as possible in his timing, for some day he may be on a network program where timing is of the utmost importance. Then it will not do to say that "When I was on the local station, WOOF, they didn't care if I ran over a minute or two or three." Of course they didn't. But they set a bad precedent for anybody who wants to learn network technique.

Now let's look at another phase of radio timing.

We spoke a moment ago of the person who feels he can hold an audience almost indefinitely. He will say that he did so for forty-five minutes at St. So-and-So's Novena last year, and the audience was held spell-bound.

All this is perhaps true. The audience was spell-bound. Agreed. But how and why was it so overwhelmed? First of all, that audience could see the speaker as well as hear him. It is much easier to listen to somebody you can see than to someone you cannot. Maybe forty-five minutes was a good length of time for that particular audience where the speaker could watch its reactions and see that the listeners were in a state of rapt attention.

But the fact remains that on radio the audience cannot see the speaker and the speaker cannot see the audience. It is of course quite possible that the unseen radio audience might be simply

panting for the speaker to go on, but he doesn't know that. On the other hand, the radio audience might be just anxious for him to stop, but he doesn't know that either.

So I suppose the only thing for the speaker to do is to follow the findings of radio men. And most radio men, producers and directors, will tell you that a fifteen-minute talk on a thirty-minute program is about as long as you can go without tiring the audience. This may sound like a rule-of-thumb argument, but it is a pretty sound one.

Straight talks, that is, talks by one person, are pretty hard to listen to. The ear becomes fatigued, specially if the speaker has a certain recurring rhythmic pattern to his speech. After all, radio is built on contrasts—emotional, dramatic, and dynamic. Usually a talk is quite un-dynamic, and therefore fails to hold the listener's interest.

Naturally, there are exceptions to this rule of limitation of time on the air. Some speakers, because of their tremendous radio personalities can hold an audience longer than the fifteen-minute period we have mentioned for a thirty-minute program. You have but to look back upon the late President Roosevelt who was one of the world's great radio speakers. Another example is Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen. Both of these men have, through a natural gift which was carefully cultivated, been able to hold audiences because of what radio men describe as "radio personalities." We shall see shortly what this term really means.

But for the beginning speaker, or the person who is not an expert in the techniques of radio, it is better to have the radio audience, like any audience, go away unsatisfied and wishing the talk had lasted longer, than to have it switch to another program in boredom.

As we pointed out before, the mere fact of keeping people in their seats in a lecture hall, or a church perhaps, may mean nothing more than that they were unable, because of social pressure, to get up and walk out, although they might have wished to.

The radio speaker, unless he has had years of experience and some natural flair for the medium, works pretty blindly. So he should be ready to accede to the producer's request that he talk only so long and no longer.

There is still another reason for watching timing very closely on the air and this is a purely technical one.

When a radio program is in rehearsal, the producer must time

each component of the program—the music, the continuity which the announcer reads, and the featured talk. Usually the talk comes somewhere about the middle of the show. Now if all the other elements are carefully timed, and the talk runs too long or too short, the producer will just have one more worry added to those he already has.

This is, then, not only a question of etiquette, so to say, towards the producer, but it makes for a smooth show if the talk runs the length it ran during rehearsal. For then, at the last minute the producer will not have to make adjustments which always subtly show up to the audience.

Most people, it might be noted here, have a tendency to talk slower on the air than they do in rehearsal.

On remote pick-ups, that is, where the speaker is in one studio and the choir is in another city, perhaps, the matter of timing is most important, for the poor producer with the choir will be at his wits' end wondering when the talk is going to end. Besides, he has carefully timed his end of the program, and if the speaker "slops over," it will just add the proverbial grey hairs to his head in trying to make everything come out even at the end.

There is another aspect of timing which hasn't too much to do with the length of the program but rather belongs to the delivery of the talk, and we shall discuss it then.

(*To be continued*)

WILLIAM C. SMITH

The National Council of Catholic Men
Washington, D. C.

MISSION INTENTION

The Mission Intention for the month of November, 1948, is "that the rights of workingmen in Africa may be vindicated in accordance with Christian principles."

FACTORS IN CHURCH UNITY

The recent and eminently well-publicized Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam has attracted a great deal of attention to the problems of ecclesiastical unity. According to one of its leaders, this Assembly was meant to "draw together into fuller understanding and co-operation the divided groupings of the servants of Christ in the world." [1] The magazine, *Time,* with the somewhat drooling enthusiasm it ordinarily manifests for certain favored movements and persons, asserted that "Amsterdam set up a better human means toward the blessed end of Christian unity than the world had known since the first great schism, between the Roman Catholic and the Eastern Orthodox churches, in the year 1054." [2] There is reason to believe that a great many people share this naive notion.

There can be no doubt whatsoever that the Amsterdam assembly took a long and important step in the direction of some sort of religious unity. Unfortunately, however, the emergence from Amsterdam as one of the leaders of the World Council of an individual whose previous claims to prominence had been based almost exclusively on an interminable series of wearisome and spectactularly unscientific tirades against the Catholic Church and its hierarchy has given rise to questions about the type of unity envisioned by the World Council. In the past there have been calls to Protestant religious unity which, behind the facade of sonorous and pious pronouncements, have actually centered around the idea of united opposition to the true Church of Jesus Christ. It is to be hoped that no such primary motive lies behind the organization formed at Amsterdam.

From the theological point of view, the procedure and the mentality of the Amsterdam assembly are quite interesting. The groups taking part in this conference set out to co-operate with each other, regardless of their doctrinal differences. Thus, in one way or another, all of them acted on the supposition that the common work they hope to accomplish must be considered as something of greater import than and objectively superior to the accurate presentation of divine revelation.

[1] *Time,* LII, 5 (Aug. 2, 1948), 37.

[2] *Time,* LII, 11 (Sept. 13, 1948), 55.

Each one of the religious bodies entering into the new federation holds some kind of teaching as its creed, as its concept of what God has revealed to mankind. By allying itself with other organizations, each holding a distinct profession of religious belief, the individual communion in a general assembly of the Amsterdam type seems to imply that doctrinal divergence is not a matter of essential importance at all.

Furthermore, the unity desired and achieved at Amsterdam consists in an association of already existent religious societies, each with its individual beliefs and customs. The federation itself is not regarded as God's kingdom on earth, but simply as a means for the advancement of this objective. Although religious communities which profess to believe in the existence of a visible Church as God's kingdom in this world took part in the meeting, the mentality behind the association itself is obviously that of the invisible Church, the doctrine that the company of Christ on this earth consists, not in any one society, but in the unorganized mass of people who sympathize with the teachings or the work of Our Lord. Objectively the Amsterdam conference simply seeks to bring these people together for more complete and efficacious common religious activity. Out of this communal labor, the participants hope to achieve more effectively, through social and perhaps political channels, their common purpose. In a federation composed of groups whose professions of faith differ rather sharply from one another, that ultimate purpose will be largely humanitarian.

It is unfortunate that, at a time when the interest of the world at large is centered about the concept of ecclesiastical unity, our own scholastic text-books deal with the oneness of the true Church of Jesus Christ almost exclusively in terms of a visible note of the Church. Thus Hervé speaks of the unity of the Church as "the property by which it is undivided in itself and distinct from every other society in the profession of the faith, in government, and in cult." [3] Dorsch deals with the Church's unity under its symbolical, liturgical, and social functions.[4] Zapelena explains that the true Church is one in its faith, in its rule, and in its communion.[5]

[3] *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae* (Paris: Berche et Pagis, 1929), I, 357.

[4] Cf. *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis* (Innsbruck, 1928), II, 562 ff.

[5] Cf. *De ecclesia Christi* (Rome: The Gregorian University, 1946), I, 384 ff.

In every instance these modern ecclesiologists confine their teaching on the unity of the Church to something which the older scholastic doctors considered only one element or aspect of that unity. They deal with what the classical ecclesiologists called the "outward" or the "bodily" bond of unity within Our Lord's society. This particular factor is one of the realities which St. Robert Bellarmine designated by the metaphor, "the body of the Church." [6] It consists of three elements, the profession of the same divine faith, the partaking of the same sacraments, and subjection to legitimate ecclesiastical rulers, and ultimately to the successor of St. Peter, the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, the Bishop of Rome.

This "outward" bond of unity owes its importance in modern theology to the fact that the great classical ecclesiologists showed that actual membership in the true Church of Christ on earth is definable in terms of this element, and of no other. A man is really a member of the true Church only when he has not publicly recanted his baptismal profession of the divine faith, when he has not been completely excluded from participation in the sacarments, and when he retains his subjection to the legitimate authority within this visible society. The immediate purpose of St. Robert Bellarmine's *De ecclesia militante* was to prove that, according to the clear teachings of divine revelation, no other characteristics are requisite to constitute a man as a member of God's kingdom on earth. All and only the men united with Our Lord by the outward or visible bonds of unity are members of the true Church.

St. Robert and the other classical ecclesiologists were, however, well aware of the fact that this outward bond of unity was by no means the only factor uniting men to Our Lord within His kingdom on earth. What they called the spiritual or inward bond of unity (and what St. Robert referred to on one famous occasion as as "the soul of the Church") included the three theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity.[7] As components of this same bond of unity, St. Robert also mentioned "other gifts of the Holy Ghost." Here the expression obviously refers, not exclusively to the seven gifts as distinct from the virtues, but to any and all benefits other than the three theological virtues, infused into the soul by God to bring man to Himself in the unity of His Church.

This spiritual or inward bond of unity works quite differently

[6] Cf. *De ecclesia militante,* cap. 2. [7] Cf. *ibid.*

from the other. The outward bond of unity, that in function of which a man is constituted as a member of the Church militant, is something which does not admit of degrees, in the proper sense of the term. A man either is or is not a member of the true Church. Strictly speaking, one man cannot be any more a member than another. All of those who possess the threefold qualification that makes up this outward bond of unity are members of God's household.

Faith, hope, and charity, on the other hand, actually admit of degrees of intensity and perfection. One man's faith may be stronger than another's. The man with the stronger faith is no more truly a member of the Church than his fellow Catholic, but he is more perfectly united to Our Lord in the Church in this way. The same thing holds true of hope, and, most completely, of charity. The man with a more perfect charity is more fully joined within the actual unity of the Church than the man with a less intensive love for God and his neighbor.

Hence, according to the teachings of Catholic theology, every member of the true Church of Jesus Christ should work for and accomplish a definite advance in ecclesiastical unity within the framework of his own life. By the power of God's grace, every man is able to make his belief in God more resolute, his hope in God more firm, and his love for God more intense and effective. In progressing thus, a man unites himself more perfectly to God and integrates himself more completely within God's kingdom. The apostolic work which strives to increase the intensity of the spiritual life within the Church is, therefore, essentially a labor for the increase of Church unity. That co-operation of the laity in the work of the hierarchy which the men of our day know as Catholic Action has precisely the same effect.

Another way of working for the advance of ecclesiastical unity is, of course, the missionary effort itself. The true Church of Christ does not become any more perfectly unified by the accession of new converts. Still it remains true that a man works for the unity of the Church by laboring to bring the ineffable benefits of that unity to souls for whom Christ died.

That, for all practical purposes, marks the difference between the concept of ecclesiastical unity which guided the conference at Amsterdam and the true notion of Church unity, enshrined in the teaching of Catholic theology. The men gathered at Amsterdam

worked on the assumption that Church unity in itself is something which has yet to be achieved. They sought some new form of association among the followers of Christ.

Catholic theology, on the other hand, knows that the essential unity of the Church itself is something which has been constituted, once and for all, by Our Lord. The true Church as such will never become any more perfectly or completely one than it is at this moment, even though its individual members may and should become ever more completely integrated into it. The visible or outward bond of unity admits of no degrees. The Church is, and ever will be, as completely and perfectly organized a society as it has been since the day of its inception.

Even on the plane of the invisible or spiritual bond of unity, the oneness of the Church in itself is something which does not change from age to age. We must not forget the paramount fact that Our Lord is, according to His own promise, within the Church militant always. The faith of the members of the Church militant is essentially an effect produced by the truth and the understanding of Christ. The charity of the Church is basically and essentially His charity.

Thus, work for Church unity must be judged according to the standards of work for God Himself. Work for God does not seek to increase and to perfect His happiness. It strives simply to bring God's creatures to share and to enjoy His eternal goodness. Similarly, work for Church unity, according to the true teaching of divine public revelation, does not seek to make the kingdom of God on earth in any way more perfectly or completely one. It seeks simply to bring within the company of Christ men who have not as yet enjoyed the blessings of that unity, and to increase the fullness of integration into the unity of Christ's body in those men who already possess the grace of association with Him in His Church.

The ultimate cause of the Church's unity, along the lines of both the visible and the invisible bonds, is to be found in the presence of Christ as the Head of the Church and in the indwelling of the Holy Ghost within this society. The divine Head of the Church preserves and protects it, maintaining it indefectibly in the face of manifest forces which, apart from His influence, would quickly destroy or modify it. Thus, in continuing to exist and to act as one society according to the constitution which Our Lord originally

gave it, the Church itself is a true miracle of the social order, and a real motive of credibility in favor of the message it presents to the world as divine revelation. The sacred humanity of Christ is the supreme instrument of this ecclesiastical unity.

The real indwelling of the Holy Ghost within the Catholic Church is also a cause, a principal cause, of the Church's unity. The Holy Ghost is said to reside within His creatures in a new and supernatural way, that is, in a manner distinct from that in which God dwells in all the things He has brought into being, when He is present as the principle and as the object of the life of sanctifying grace. According to the divine dispensation itself, the life of sanctifying or habitual grace finds its corporate expression in this world in and through the activity of the Catholic Church. The essential work of the Church, manifested in its liturgy, is that of charity, motivating Christian hope, and enlightened by divine faith. Hence the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, to whom as the divine principle these activities are attributed, must be designated as the cause of that ecclesiastical unity which results from faith, hope, and charity.

The sacraments of the Church, especially Baptism and the Eucharist, also figure as instrumental causes of the true unity of Our Lord's Church. Objectively, Baptism constitutes an act of incorporation into the one body of Christ. It is the profession of faith in God, the manifestation of acceptance of the one teaching Our Lord presented to His followers. Thus it stands as a factor in the unity of these disciples of Christ, organized into one visible society by the divine Master Himself.

The Blessed Eucharist is an outstanding principle in the unity of the Church. St. Thomas Aquinas described it as "the sacrament of ecclesiastical unity,"[8] and taught that, in the case of the Eucharist, the *res sacramenti* is "the unity of the Mystical Body." [9] In the final analysis, the effectiveness of the Eucharist as a principle of the Church's unity stems from the fact that this sacrament is ultimately ordered to manifest charity itself, and to bring about an increase in grace through the exercise of charity in the person who receives it. Charity stands as the ultimate and perfective element in the spiritual bond of unity within the Church. It is the force, produced by Our Lord, and by the Holy Ghost dwelling within this society, which gathers the disciples of Christ into that oneness He procured for them by His prayer and sacrifice.

[8] Cf. II-II, q. 73, a. 2.

[9] Cf. II-II, q. 73, a. 3.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the so-called outward bond of ecclesiastical unity, comprising the profession of divine faith, the communication of the sacraments, and subjection to legitimate ecclesiastical authority, has traditionally been termed the "bodily" bond, while the inward factor, including faith, hope, charity, and the other gifts of the Holy Ghost, has been designated as "spiritual." The theologians who employed this terminology meant to teach that these two groups of forces were related to one another in something like the manner in which the human body is referred to the soul.

The human body exists and acts for the sake of the soul. The soul is the perfective and active element. In much the same way, the profession of the faith, the communication of the sacraments, and the subjection to divinely instituted ecclesiastical authority exist for the sake of the faith, hope, and charity that compose the inward bond of union within the Church of Jesus Christ.

The human body is a dead thing apart from the soul. In somewhat the same manner, the elements which go to make up the outward bond of unity have no meaning or purpose apart from the faith, hope, and charity they are meant to manifest and aid. It was perfectly proper, then, for the greatest of all the scholastic ecclesiologists, St. Robert Bellarmine, to indicate faith, hope, and charity as constituting in a certain fashion "the soul of the Church." [10] Subsequent theological writers were to abuse that terminology, and to employ it in propounding a conclusion quite opposed to St. Robert's basic teaching. The abuse of the term was unfortunate, but the reason for the expression in the *De ecclesia militante* is tremendously important to the modern student of sacred theology. Practically speaking, it means that a treatment of ecclesiastical unity which omits or neglects an element of it which can be compared to the outward bond of unity as the soul is compared to the body is hopelessly inadequate.

It is interesting to note that when St. Thomas taught about the unity of the Church in his *Expositio super symbolo apostolorum,* he spoke only in terms of the unity of faith, of hope, and of charity.[11] After the conciliar disputes of the fifteenth century, the Cardinal

[10] Cf. *De ecclesia militante,* cap. 2.

[11] This opusculum is numbered 33 in the Mandonnet edition and 6 in the old Roman collection.

John de Turrecremata offered a much more complete explanation, mentioning that the Church is one in terms also of one supreme pastor, the vicar of Christ on earth.

It was Turrecremata's contention that there are no less than eight factors which must be taken into consideration in any explanation of the Church's unity. He pointed first to the unity of the Prince or Head of the Church, Our Lord Himself. The Church is one reality because it is an association gathered together and held together by Our Lord.

The second element mentioned in Turrecremata's teaching on the unity of the Church is the oneness of the faith. Under this heading the old Cardinal expressly adverted to the fact that Our Lord's true followers believe and profess one body of teaching. The third factor is the unity of the sacrament of Baptism, and of the other sacraments, particularly of the Blessed Eucharist. The fourth element is the unity of hope, and the fifth, the unity of charity.

The sixth factor in this unity is the oneness of the Holy Ghost, residing within the Church and animating this society in its salvific function. The seventh is the unity of purpose, the oneness of the end for which the Church militant labors on this earth. The eighth and final element to be considered in explaining the oneness of God's kingdom in this world is the unity of government within the visible society instituted and maintained by Our Lord.[12]

It is unfortunate that a somewhat misguided effort to explain the note of unity has induced many of our modern theological writers to neglect what is objectively the most important portion of the traditional teaching about the oneness of Our Lord's Church. It is imperative, especially in view of the conditions prevailing in our own times, that the members of the true Church be made to realize that faith, hope, and charity in themselves are factors tending to unite Catholics with each other and with Our Lord in His Church. The all-too-prevalent notion that our faith joins us indifferently to all of those who employ the name of faith to designate their opinions on matters religious, and that charity joins us primarily to some amorphous group of "men of good will" can only be countered and rectified by the true teaching that faith and charity are ties which unite us to Our Lord and with each other within His kingdom on earth.

[12] Cf. *Summa de ecclesia* (Venice, 1561), pp. 7v ff.

An adequate exposition of the doctrine on the unity of the Church should manifest the dangerous and unwarranted attitude of those Catholic publicists who are ever ready to defend "religion in general," or the broad religious truths which we are supposed to hold in common with the members of other religious communities, but who seem somewhat reluctant to deal with specifically Catholic doctrines and attitudes. These men, many of whom obviously mean well, have lost sight of the fact that the realities of faith and charity, far from being opposed to the "juridical" bonds of unity within the visible Catholic Church, are actually the factors to which these outward bonds are themselves ordained. They have forgotten that the unity of faith and of charity, no less than the unity brought about by the Christian's submission to Christ's vicar on earth, is something effected within that visible society which we know as the Catholic Church. Moreover, any attempt at the Christian unity of faith and charity outside of this visible society is objectively something which runs counter to the intention and teaching of Jesus Christ.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

FAITH A CHRISTIAN BOND OF UNION

"One Lord, one faith," writes the Apostle: the faith, that is, by which we hold fast to God, and to Him whom He has sent, Jesus Christ. The beloved Apostle tells us how closely this faith binds us to God: "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God abideth in him, and he in God." This Christian faith binds us no less closely with each other and with our Divine Head. For all of us who believe, "having the same spirit of faith," are illumined by the same light of Christ, are nourished by the same food of Christ, and live under the jurisdiction and teaching authority of Christ. If the same spirit of faith breathes in us all, we are all living the same life "in the faith of the Son of God, who loved us and delivered Himself for us." And once Christ, our Head, through an ardent faith enters into us and dwells within our hearts, He becomes the "Author and Finisher" of our faith.

—Pope Pius XII, in the encyclical *Mystici corporis,* issued June 29, 1943.

Answers to Questions

THE PASTOR'S TELEPHONE

Question: Is a pastor obliged in conscience to have a telephone in his rectory? And, in the supposition that there is such an obligation, must he make public his telephone number? Would a pastor in a busy city parish be allowed to cut off his telephone on Sunday morning, when it is the source of so much disturbance from people inquiring about the time of the Masses?

Answer: I am of the opinion that nowadays a pastor is bound to have a telephone in his rectory—at least in those localities where telephones are a common convenience among the people, as in the greater part of the United States. For undoubtedly occasions arise when the ministry of the priest is urgently needed—when even the salvation of a soul may depend on a few minutes' earlier arrival, particularly when a person is in sudden danger of death. A summons by telephone is the ordinary means of getting the priest on such occasions. It might be objected that the Code Commission has declared the use of the telephone an extraordinary means of communication, so that there is no obligation to have a telephone available (Cf. *AAS,* XIV [1922], 662). But this decision was concerned with communication with the Ordinary for the procuring of dispensations for which the Church itself can supply; consequently, the Church can determine what is an ordinary means, what an extraordinary means. But we are here faced with cases in which the Church cannot supply for the ministry of a priest on which the eternal fate of a dying person may depend. And so, on the principle that the pastor must use all reasonable means to provide his people with sacraments when they need them, a telephone seems to be an obligatory appurtenance of a rectory at the present day.

The reply to the second question logically follows from what has already been said. The pastor's telephone is primarily for the benefit of the people, rather than for his own convenience. Hence, the telephone number must be available to the people—normally by being printed in the telephone book. Of course, the pastor could also have a private telephone in addition to the one to which the public can have recourse when they wish to communicate with the rectory. For a priest with the care of souls to keep his telephone

number a secret from his people would be as inconsistent and as inconsiderate as for a doctor to refuse to give his number to his patients who may need his services. Those bishops who require their priests to publish their telephone numbers are to be commended.

Since there are usually people who do not know the hours of the Sunday Masses, and have no other means available than a telephone call to the rectory, it is difficult to justify a pastor who disconnects his telephone on Sunday morning just because of the inconvenience of answering frequent calls. Moreover, an urgent sick call is just as likely to occur on Sunday as on any other day of the week. The annoyance of answering the phone every five or ten minutes is very small compared to the tragedy of a Catholic dying without the sacraments because the priest could not be summoned in time.

The gist of what has been said amounts to this: the pastor is the servant of his people. He must be at their beck and call when they stand in reasonable need of his services. If this involves inconvenience, and at times even unreasonable and unnecessary calls, he must accept this as a part of the burden he has voluntarily accepted.

A DOUBT ABOUT BAPTISM

Question: Titius, a priest of several years' standing, has grave doubts about the validity of his baptism. He was baptized on the day of his birth at a Catholic hospital by a woman—probably a nurse. He does not know whether or not the essential features of the sacrament were repeated conditionally by the priest who supplied the ceremonies, and who is now dead. His parents are still alive, but he hesitates to question them about the matter lest they may be scandalized, now that their son has officiated as a priest for several years. The confessor of Titius has told him not to worry, but he cannot help worrying, and wonders what he should do.

Answer: It is astounding that Titius should have been allowed to receive Holy Orders when there was so much uncertainty about the validity of his Baptism. There should have been a thorough examination of the matter at least when he entered the seminary (if not earlier) and if there was any reasonable doubt as to whether he was baptized validly, the sacrament should have been repeated conditionally. However, in view of the facts as they are at present,

all data on the matter should be obtained as soon as possible. Even though there may be danger of surprise or scandal, the parents of Titius should be asked to give all the information they possess about the case—who was the person that baptized, whether there was a conditional repetition of the sacrament by a priest, whether there was any exact investigation of the original Baptism, etc. If any doubt remains, the case should be submitted immediately to the bishop, and his decision should be followed. If no greater certainty of the validity of the Baptism can be obtained than is indicated in the question, a bishop would undoubtedly be justified in repeating conditionally the sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Orders, for the greater assurance of Titius and of the Church.

BACON AS A CONDIMENT

Question: Is it permitted on a day of abstinence to prepare and to eat fish with strips of bacon spread over it as a condiment?

Answer: Canon 1250 allows the use of condiments, even from the fat of animals, on a day of abstinence. By a condiment is meant something that is used *in small quantity* to render the food more tasty (Cf. Prümmer, *Manuale theologiae moralis* [Friburg Brisgov., 1936], II, n. 663). It would seem that in the *preparation* of the fish (cooking or baking) bacon could be used in the manner described. Thus, a small quantity of the bacon and the juice would be absorbed in the fish, and that could be considered *per modum condimenti.* But the strips of bacon should be removed before the fish is eaten, for it would be a violation of the law of abstinence (though not necessarily a grave violation) to eat an entire strip of bacon, even though it was quite thin.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

LOCAL CALENDAR AND *ORATIO IMPERATA* IN PRIVATE CHAPELS

Question: Does the obligation of following the local calendar extend to Masses in private chapels and the subsidiary chapels in seminaries and other institutions? What of the obligation of the *oratio imperata* in such chapels?

Answer: The rubric governing the conformity of the Mass with

the dispositions of the local calendar is contained in the front of the Missal (*Add. et Var.* IV, 6). There we read: "Omnes et singuli Sacerdotes, tam saeculares quam regulares, Missas, etsi Regularium proprias, omnino celebrant juxta Kalendarium Ecclesiae, vel Oratorii publici, in quo celebrant; exclusis tamen peculiaribus ritibus Ordinum et Ecclesiarum propriis. Idem servetur in Oratorio semipublico, sive in Capella principali Seminariorum, Collegiorum, piarum Communitatum, Hospitalium, Carcerum et similium." Since this regulation expressly states that it applies to churches and public and semi-public oratories and among the last named expressly defines the *principal* chapel of an institution, we conclude that it does not apply to subsidiary chapels, or oratories for the accommodation of a number of priests attached to the institution. We likewise understand that this conformity is not required in private, or domestic, oratories.

Concerning the obligation of adding the local *oratio imperata* in Masses in private oratories or in the subordinate chapels, mentioned above, the generic tenor of the words of the decree (S.R.C. No. 3985, March 5, 1898) indicates that the *oratio imperata* must be said at Masses wherever said within the territory of the Ordinary who prescribes it. However, the opposite opinion may be defended with solid probability, based on the context of the decree cited above.

ROOMS ABOVE OR BELOW CHURCHES AND CHAPELS

Question: What are the canonical regulations concerning rooms above or below a chapel? Is it sufficient to arrange a chapel, say in a convent, so that the altar would be in a bay-window and so no sleeping room would be immediately above it?

Answer: A distinction must be drawn between buildings which are technically churches or public oratories and structures or rooms which rank as semi-public or private oratories. Canon 1164 of the *Codex juris* forbids the use of space either underneath or above a *church* to be used for merely secular purposes. The prohibition refers to churches, and Canon 1191 applies to public oratories the same restrictions as those contained in the regulations for churches. These provisions, therefore, do not affect semi-public, and, *a fortiori,* private oratories.

Where there is question of the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, however, whether the place of reservation is church or oratory, whether the later be public, semi-public, or private, decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (Nos. 756, 3525, and 4313) prescribe that the *altar* where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved be not placed *beneath* any apartments used as living or sleeping quarters. Hence, in the case of a convent chapel, which is a semi-public oratory, the requirements of the law are fulfilled if the altar is placed in a bay-window or similar alcove so that it will not have any sleeping or living room above it. The case of the private oratory is not usually affected by these restrictions as only by Apostolic Indult may the Blessed Sacrament be reserved in such a chapel.

ORATIO IMPERATA AT A NUPTIAL MASS

Question: Since the Nuptial Mass is one which enjoys many privileges, is it proper to omit the *oratio imperata* in that Mass? We omit this oration in the special Votive of the Sacred Heart on the First Friday of the month, should it not also be omitted in the Mass *pro Sponso et Sponsa?*

Answer: Despite the many privileges attached to the celebration of the Nuptial Mass, it ranks as a *Missa votiva privata,* even when it is sung with deacon and subdeacon. The Votive of the Sacred Heart, which is celebrated on the First Friday of the month, is to be classed as a Votive Mass *ad instar Missae Votivae solemnis.* Hence, the *oratio imperata* must be said in the *Missa pro Sponso et Sponsa,* even though it is omitted in the special Mass of the Sacred Heart, proper to the First Friday of the month. The general provisions of the rubrics of the Missal (*Add. et Var.* VI, 4) direct that the *oratio imperata* is to be omitted in votive Masses, which are *pro re gravi et publica simul causa vel ad instar solemnium.* This ruling would exclude the obligation of the *imperata* from the First Friday Votive as being *ad instar solemnium,* but not from the private votive, which is the Nuptial Mass.

THE MASTER OF CEREMONIES AT *MISSA CANTATA*

Question: We have been accustomed to have an older altar-boy act as master of ceremonies at the *Missa Cantata.* Is it correct

to employ one at such a Mass in addition to the two acolytes and, if so, what duties should be assigned to him?

Answer: While there is no official ruling as to the employment of a master of ceremonies at *Missa Cantata,* it is quite proper to have one, even simply *ad augendam solemnitatem.* When he is sufficiently instructed to do so, we should have the boy assist the celebrant at the book, remaining beside the officiant all the time that he is at the altar, since he would not have to yield place to the deacon or subdeacon, as at Solemn Mass. During the *Gloria* and *Credo,* the master of ceremonies should stand near the bench to give the usual signals to the celebrant for removing and replacing the biretta. The master of ceremonies would be in general charge of the function, directing the movements of the acolytes, torch-bearers, and others assisting at the Mass. He would not, however, perform any of the distinctive services proper to the acolytes, such as transferring the Missal, presenting the cruets, or ringing the bell.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

A PRIEST'S RESOLUTIONS

On that solemn day, of his ordination, St. John Bosco set down on paper his inward resolutions:

"He would attend no public spectacle; would appear at festival dinners only when absolutely necessary; would give up acrobatics, the violin and hunting, things that accord ill with the true priestly spirit.

"He would be much in retreat: would drink, eat, sleep only so much as his health required.

"As he had served the world by reading books not religious, he would try to serve God by reading books of devotion.

"With all his strength he would resist the very shadow of an act, word or thought against the virtue of chastity, and at the same time would neglect no slightest practice for the preservation of that virtue.

"To the ordinary exercises of piety he would add every day a time for meditation and spiritual reading; every day also he would give his neighbour some example or some maxim tending to the elevation of his soul."

Then, in front of Our Lady's statue, he made a formal promise to observe these resolutions to the letter. His new life had begun.

—Henri Ghéon, in *The Secret of St. John Bosco* (New York: Sheed & Ward, Inc., 1946), p. 79.

Analecta

Under date of Nov. 27, 1947,[1] the Pontifical Commission for the Interpretation of the Canons of the Code handed down a decision in which it determines that exempt religious, in cases in which they are subject to the local Ordinary in accordance with Canon 611, have the right to correspond secretly with him by mail to the exclusion of any inspection whatever of incoming or outgoing mail. Another ruling, dated Apr. 26, 1948,[2] by its own terms non-retroactive but effective from the date of its publication in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* provides that to incur the penalties of Canon 2341 for the temerarious violation of the *privilegium fori,* it is sufficient to enter suit before a secular judge even though subpoena should not be served on the privileged cleric. A third interpretation, dated May 31, 1948,[3] requires that the proxy for marriage be designated immediately by the party and not by a person commissioned by him.

The *monitum* of the Holy Office of June 5, 1948,[4] insisted on the observance by laymen, clerics, and religious of the rule of Canon 1325, § 3, which requires that Catholics shall not participate in debates or discussions, especially public ones, with non-Catholics, without the permission of the Holy See or, in a case of emergency, of the local Ordinary. It warned that Catholics must not organize such meetings and it reminded Ordinaries of their responsibility to provide for the required obedience to the law. It emphasized the point that the permission of the Holy See is indispensable to participation in so-called "ecumenical" conventions of this sort. It finally called attention to the fact that even outside such meetings communication with non-Catholics in acts of worship (*communicatio in sacris*) is forbidden in accordance with the norms of Canons 1258 and 731, § 2.

In a declaration of May 23, 1948,[5] the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities stated that since under the Apostolic Constitution, *Deus scientiarum Dominus,* of May 24, 1931, the

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XL (1948), 301.
[2] *Ibid.,* p. 301.
[3] *Ibid.,* p. 302.
[4] *Ibid.,* p. 257.
[5] *Ibid.,* p. 260.

same conditions must be fulfilled to obtain the Licentiate as were previously required for the Doctorate, the former is now possessed of the same juridical effects as the latter previously was, unless the Apostolic See makes special provision in individual cases and with the special exception of the qualifications required in an Auditor of the Rota, who must be a Doctor of Both Laws (Canon 1598, § 2), and in a Professor in a Pontifical University, who is required to possess the Doctorate (Constitution, *Deus scientiarum Dominus,* art. 21, 2°).

The same Sacred Congregation, in a decree of May 1, 1948,[6] referring to the organization in Rome in 1946 of the Lithuanian College of St. Casimir for the training of dispersed Lithuanian seminarians and priests, conferred juridical status on it and gave it the same rights, duties and privileges as those possessed by other ecclesiastical colleges in Rome.

The establishment of secular institutes, authorized by the Constitution, *Provida Mater Ecclesia,* of Feb. 2, 1947,[7] was the concern of a *Motu proprio* of March 12, 1948,[8] and of an Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of Religious of March 19, 1948.[9] Both insist that when a society possesses the requisites for transformation into a secular institute it must not be left in the status of an association of the faithful governed by Canons 684-725. Both also emphasize the fact that the law governing religious institutes is generally inapplicable to these secular institutes. The Instruction specifically notes that the norms it lays down are rather general. These norms remind one of the required procedure in the foundation of a religious institute of diocesan approval. Since, however, the Sacred Congregation has made the modifications suggested by the diverse nature of the secular institute, this Instruction must necessarily serve as a guide in the formation of such an institute.

On May 30, 1948,[10] our Holy Father delivered a radio message to His Eminence, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, Archbishop of Estergom and Primate of Hungary, in commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the Eucharistic Congress held at Budapest, at which

[6] *Ibid.,* p. 298.

[7] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XXXIX (1947), 114; *The Jurist,* VII (1947), 238.

[8] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XL (1948), 283.

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 293.

[10] *Ibid.,* p. 254.

as Eugenio Cardinal Pacelli he assisted as Papal Legate. The message was marked by sympathy for the intervening deluge of misery and praise for the tenacity of the Hungarian people in their adherence to the spiritual values of the Christian faith. In this tenacity our Holy Father said he saw the hope not only of their own perseverance but of the contribution they would make to world recovery. The message closed with the Apostolic Benediction.

On June 2, 1948,[11] our Holy Father delivered an allocution to the College of Cardinals in response to their felicitations on the occasion of his feast day. After noting that they had so acted for the first time through their new Dean, he paid his respectful gratitude to the late Cardinal Gennaro Pignatelli di Belmonte. He then expressed the source of courage he found in the example of his patron and in the power of the latter's intercession. He reminded the Cardinals that the characteristic trait of the Church and of the the Supreme Pontiff is found in the antiphon, *"Dum esset Summus Pontifex, terrena non metuit."* He warned them that victory should not cause Catholics to fall back into lethargy but that wakefulness was needed to bring about the social reforms in the hope of which victory was achieved. He pointed to the necessity of showing Catholics that they could not pretend to be children of the Church while enrolled in the camp of the Church's enemies and he expressed the hope that the Church would not be obliged to apply to them the rigorous sentence of our Lord, "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." He prayed that permanent peace might follow the truce in Palestine and he expressed his hope that the twenty-fifth Holy Year to be observed in 1950 would at once be an eloquent demonstration, in the midst of discord, of the remarkable unity of the Church and the beginning of an era of peace, prosperity and progress. The allocution closed with the Apostolic Benediction.

In an epistle of May 8, 1948,[12] our Holy Father sent his Apostolic Benediction to the General Chapter of the Order of Clerks Regular of St. Camille de Lellis, which met in June at Padua. Another epistle, dated May 10, 1948,[13] extended the Apostolic Benediction and the felicitations of our Holy Father to His Eminence, Giovanni Battista Cardinal Nasalli-Rocca, Archbishop of Bologna, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his elevation to the

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 247. [12] *Ibid.*, p. 245. [13] *Ibid.*, p. 246.

Sacred College; the epistle also granted His Eminence the faculty of giving the papal blessing, with an attached plenary indulgence, after the Pontifical Mass celebrated in connection with the observance of the anniversary. A third epistle, dated Apr. 11, 1948,[14] extended the Apostolic Benediction to the monks, nuns, and oblates of the Benedictine Congregation of St. Mary of Mount Olivet to mark their observance of the sixth centenary of the death of their founder, Blessed Bernard Ptolemy. The civil observance in Egypt of the sixteenth anniversary of the death of St. Pachomius afforded our Holy Father an opportunity of sending an epistle, dated March 25, 1948,[15] to the hierarchy and the people of the Alexandrian Patriarchate of the Copts, in which he extended to them his Apostolic Benediction and expressed his hope that the spirit of unity with which the dissidents participated in the honor shown St. Pachomius, might, through remembrance that he preached the unity of the brotherhood, inspire in them a desire to be reconciled with the Chief Pastor of all.

By two Apostolic Letters the dignity of Minor Basilica was conferred respectively, under date of Aug. 30, 1947,[16] on the Church of St. Vincent Ferrer and St. Catherine de Ricci in the Diocese and City of Prato; and, under date of Oct. 7, 1947,[17] on the Church of St. Syrus in the City of Sanremo of the Diocese of Ventimiglia.

Apostolic Letters of June 2, 1947,[18] designated St. Nicholas of Flüe as the chief and principal Patron of Switzerland; and Apostolic Letters of Dec. 6, 1946,[19] appointed St. Nicholas of Bari as the chief and principal Patron of the Argentinian Diocese and City of La Rioja.

An Apostolic Constitution of March 3, 1948,[20] established three exarchates for the Ruthenians in Canada: the Central, the Eastern, and the Western Exarchate. Previously there had been only one exarchate there.

Apostolic Letters of May 4, 1947,[21] announced the beatification of the Venerable Servant of God, Marie Therésè of Jesus (Alexia Le Clerc), Foundress of the Congregation of the Canonesses Regular of St. Augustine; and Decretal Letters of June 22, 1947,[22] recited briefly the steps taken in the canonization of Blessed Joseph

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 243.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 241.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 237.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 239.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 235.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 290.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 287.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 228.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 217.

Cafasso and the act by which he was elevated to the ranks of the canonized Saints.

In the secret consistory of June 21, 1948, our Holy Father confirmed the election of Joseph Ghanima as Joseph IV, Patriarch of Babylon of the Chaldeans,[23] and of Maximus Saigh as Maximus IV, Patriarch of Antioch of the Melchites.[24] In the same consistory, His Eminence, Giuseppe Cardinal Pizzardo, was promoted to the suburbicarian See of Albano and His Eminence, Benedetto Aloisi Masella, to the See of Palestrina.[25]

The appointments published by the Sacred Consistorial Congregation include that of Most Rev. Russell J. McVinney, D.D., to the See of Providence, under date of May 29, 1948,[26] and that of Most Rev. James T. O'Dowd, D.D., Auxiliary of San Francisco, under date of May 22, 1948.[27]

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 265.
[24] *Ibid.*, p. 267.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 268.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 259.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 258.

CHRIST THE KING

Nor is any distinction to be made between individuals, the home, or civil society, for men are no less under the dominion of Christ when united in social groups than as single individuals. He alone is the source of both individual and public welfare. "Neither is there salvation in any other. For there is no other name under heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved." (Acts iv, 12) He alone is the Author of prosperity and true happiness, individual and societal. "The duties of the holy city and the duties of men do not differ; for the city is no other than a concourse of men." (St. Augustine, Letter to Macedonius, C. III) If the heads of nations wish the safety of their governments and the growth and progress of their country, they must not refuse to give, together with their people, public testimony of reverence and obedience to the empire of Christ.

—Pope Pius XI, in the encyclical *Quas Primas,* issued Dec. 11, 1925.

Book Reviews

PATRISTIQUE ET MOYEN ÂGE. ÉTUDES D'HISTOIRE LITTÉRAIRE ET DOCTRINALE. By J. de Ghellinck, S.J. Tome II: Introduction et compléments à l'étude de la patristique. Brussels: Museum Lessianum (Section historique, No. 7), 1947. Pp. 416. Fr. Belg. 300.

In Vol. I of his *Patristique et moyen âge,* the author, who is one of the most distinguished of living patristic scholars and medievalists, gave us an admirable study on the origins of the Symbol of the Apostles and on the present state of research on this problem. Vol.II is much broader in scope, and, in the reviewer's opinion at least, a much more valuable and significant contribution. It is a work of primary importance to all patrologists and medievalists, whatever may be their individual fields of specialization. The book is based essentially on articles and studies previously published by the author, but all material has been thoroughly revised and recast wherever necessary. Since the title does not indicate at all the richness and variety of the subject matter treated, it will be well here to furnish a brief indication of the book's contents.

The volume contains two main sections: *Étude I: Progrès et tendances des études patristiques depuis quinze siècles* (pp. 1-118), and *Étude II: Diffusion et transmission des écrits patristiques* (pp. 181-377). *Étude I* is divided into four chapters. *Chapter I, Contraste entre l'information patristique médiévale et l'information moderne,* deals with the paucity of patristic information in the Middle Ages, with the rise of modern editions and collections, monographs, inventories of MSS., etc., and with manuals of patrology and histories of Christian literature. Chapter II, *Progrès contemporain et son résultat actuel,* is a systematic survey in terms of fields and participating countries. Chapter III, *Causes de ce progrès et conséquences de ces tendances,* stresses the increasing interest of classical philology in the patristic field and the importance of the application of its method and outlook for patristic research. Chapter IV, *Patrologie ou histoire de la littérature chrétienne,* contains a review of the controversy over the scope and character of patrology and Early Christian literature respectively as well as some interesting personal reflections of the author on the subject. *Étude II* is likewise divided into four chapters. Chapter I, *Transcription et diffusion immédiates;* Chapter II, *Transmission et utilisation posthume;* Chapter III, *Transcription et diffusion par les papyrus;* Chapter IV, *Valeur de cette transmission. Les Pseudépigraphes et les écrits perdus. Perspectives d'avenir. Étude II* has much greater unity than *Étude I* and is, in many respects, more important. It contains an enormous amount of precious information on the conditions under which patristic literature was produced, disseminated, and transmitted in

East and West to the Middle Ages. As in all his works, the author has given copious bibliographical references in the footnotes, and he has furnished an excellent *Table alphabétique des noms d'auteurs et des matières* (pp. 379-414).

Within the limited space of a book review it would be impossible to describe the contents of Fr. de Ghellinck's masterly volume at greater length. The rest of the review, therefore, will be devoted to critical but constructive remarks on certain points.

Page 21, note 1: The author here and in other studies or reviews goes too far in questioning the reliability of investigations of language and style which are based on patristic texts established in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, especially Latin texts. Where comparison of such texts with modern critical texts is possible, as e.g., in the case of many works of St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, the changes are certainly not sufficient to invalidate, to any appreciable degree at least, the results of comprehensive investigations in the field of language and style. On the other hand, such studies can be of great help in the interpretation of an author whose works may as yet be available only in old editions, and they can render valuable aid also in the establishment of a modern critical text of that author. Page 39: No mention is made of another American series of translations of the Fathers, *The Fathers of the Church, A New Translation,* founded and directed by Ludwig Schopp and edited by R. Arbesmann, O.S.A., R. J. Deferrari, S. Kuttner, W. Parsons, S.J., B.M. Peebles, Anselm Strittmatter, O.S.B., G. G. Walsh, S.J., and the writer of this review. This series will contain 72 volumes, each about 500 pages in length. Page 41: Mention should have been made also of the new Spanish series, *Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos,* published by La Editorial Catolica S.A. (Madrid, 1946 ff.). Page 66: For "Prof. Bonner de l'Université Harvard", write "Prof. C. Bonner de l'Université de Michigan." Page 75: For "l'Université de Chicago", write "l'Université de Michigan." Pages 85 and 115: On the text of Irenaeus, see also the important study by S. Lundström, *Studien zur lateinischen Irenäusübersetzung* (Lund, 1943). Page 86: The problem of the authorship of the *De sacramentis* and *De mysteriis* is discussed but no reference is made to the authorship of the translation of the *De bello Iudaico.* The cumulative evidence furnished by three monographs in the *Catholic University of America Patristic Studies* indicates with reasonable probability that St. Ambrose was not the translator of this work. Page 92, note 5: The study of E. W. Watson, "The Style and Language of St. Cyprian," *Studia biblica et eccles.,* 4 (1896), should certainly have been listed as a pioneer study beside that of Bayard. Pages 93 and 132: The cavalier criticism of the volumes in the *Catholic University of America Patristic Studies* devoted to language and style is quite surprising, especially in the light of

the much more favorable opinions expressed by Fr. de Ghellinck in a number of his reviews in *Nouvelle revue théologique.* It is embarassing for the reviewer, as one of the editors, to come to the defense of the *Patristic Studies,* but, in all fairness, it should be pointed out that, in spite of certain shortcomings which are practically inevitable in most doctoral dissertations—and which, incidentally, are often exaggerated—these monographs in their totality constitute an important contribution to our knowledge of the language and style of the Fathers. One becomes a little irked, furthermore, by the slurring remarks of certain Continental scholars on the use of the statistical method. Statistics must be employed very judiciously in philological investigation, but relative frequencies in the use of particles, rhetorical devises, clausulae, etc., if properly evaluated, can give greater objectivity, and more definite control of evidence, than can be furnished by mere aesthetic impressions of stylistic phenomena noted at random. For sounder critical general evaluations of the *Patristic Studies,* see e.g., P. Courcelle, "Vingt anneés d'histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne," in *Memorial des études latines,* (Paris, 1943), especially pp. 245 f., and A. Dain, *Bulletin de l'Association de Guillaume Budé,* 4 (Paris, 1947), 146 f. Page 93: *Studies in Christian Antiquity* are not devoted to language and style, but rather to archaeology, history, and patristic theology. Pages 95 ff. and 133: Reference should have been made here to A. Souter's *A Glossary of the Later Latin (180-600 A. D.),* which will be published this year by the Clarendon Press. The statement, "*le Thesaurus linguae Latinae* . . . n'a pu maintenir les normes de son premier programme, qui donnait une large extension au latin patristique," is surprising, to say the least. The *Thesaurus,* given its character as a comprehensive lexicon of the Latin language from the earliest times to the 6th century A.D., covers Patristic Latin adequately; in fact, from the letter *C* on the *Thesaurus* in content and method is a model work in every way. It is not reasonable to expect that the *Thesaurus* should cover great writers like Augustine and Jerome as exhaustively as would be possible in special lexica and concordances. Page 95 f.: The statement, "Le nouveau Du Cange, qui est en préparation, devra y suppléer," is also strange. The new *Du Cange* will cover the late patristic writers at most, because it only begins with writings composed from about 500 A.D. Page 98: The great pioneer in the investigation of the cursus was not J. Have, but rather W. Meyer, who published his first epoch-making studies in this field in 1891 and 1893. Pages 111 and 232: To the references given should be added, Albert Siegmund, O.S.B., *Die Überlieferung der griechischen christlichen Literatur in der lateinischen Kirche bis zum zwölften Jahrhundert,* a Munich dissertation which, owing to conditions in Germany, is not yet available in printed form. Page 13: The author did not

know that Prof. Werner Jaeger, now at Harvard, is continuing his work on the critical edition of Gregory of Nyssa and that this edition will be completed in the next few years. Page 120: The achievements of the United States in palaeography should be mentioned beside those in archaeology and papyrology. Page 127, note 1: This volume of the *Kultur der Gegenwart* should have been used in the revised edition of 1912. Page 161: On the qualities which a new history of Christian literature should have see also B. Altaner's long article in the *Miscellanea Mercati.* Fr. de Ghellinck states in his preface that this study was not available to him when he was writing the present volume. Page 229: In connection with the problem of the two editions of the *Apologeticum* of Tertullian, reference should have been made especially to the definitive edition of H. Hoppe (Vienna, 1939). Pages 243 ff: In this section on slavish translations of Greek works, the medieval translations of Aristotle should have been mentioned beside those of Plato. Page 304: The dates for the reign of Assa, 3580-3536 B.C., which derive from Petrie, should now be discarded in favor of the much lower dates established by E. Meyer and others. Page 308: For "Old-father de l'University of Wisconsin," write "de l'University de Illinois." Page 313, note 1: Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament,* was published in ten parts but is bound as a single volume, not in three. There are a number of misprints, but only the following need be mentioned: In the *Table alphabétique* (p. 385), all references under Christ are listed for Ch. Christ only. References to pages 6, 280, and 283 concern Ch. Christ, while all other references should be to W. Christ.

Father de Ghellinck's second volume of his *Patristique et moyen âge* is an outstanding contribution to scholarship. As stated earlier in this review, it must be regarded as an indispensable tool for all scholars specializing in Early Christian or Medieval literature and theology.

MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS. Translated by Francis X. Glimm, Joseph M.-F. Marique, S.J., and Gerald G. Walsh, S.J. New York: The Cima Publishing Company, 1947. Pp. 401. $4.00.

THE EPISTLES OF ST. CLEMENT OF ROME AND ST. IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH. Translated by James A. Kleist, S.J. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1946. Pp. ix-162. $2.50.

These two volumes represent the initial fruits of two independent projects both of which have as their object to make the writings of the Fathers of the Church available in a modern English translation embodying the latest results of modern scholarship. The series *The Fathers of the Church* is being put out by the Cima Publishing Company of

New York under the general editorship of Ludwig Schopp. The other series, that of *Ancient Christian Writers,* is published by the Newman Bookshop of Wesminster, Maryland, under the editorship of Johannes Quasten and Joseph Plumpe. Both series have at their disposal capable groups of Catholic scholars.

The first volume of the series *The Fathers of the Church* contains the writings of the Apostolic Fathers—the letters of Clement and St. Ignatius of Antioch, St. Polycarp's letter to the Philippians, the *Martyrdom of Polycarp,* the *Didache,* the *Letter of Barnabas,* the *Shepherd of Hermas,* the *Letter to Diognetus,* and finally the extant fragments of Papias. This last is a very welcome addition, for here have been gathered together all the known fragments of that little known but most important witness to the Apostolic Tradition. The typography is clear and attractive. There is a short but excellent introduction for each writer and the texts of the translations themselves are furnished with satisfactory footnotes. For some reason the Greek words occasionally appearing in these footnotes have been printed in Latin characters.

The first volume of the series *Ancient Christian Writers* includes only the letters of Clement and St. Ignatius. The remainder of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers have been reserved for a forthcoming volume of this same series. For each writer there is a good introduction and short bibliography. Unlike the Cima series, the notes, which are somewhat fuller and contain more philological material than those of the Cima, have been relegated to the back of the book. These notes also contain a separate introductory note for each individual letter.

Both of these sets of translations are extremely well done. They, are readable and they offer quite satisfactory renderings of the original Greek texts. In comparing them both to the original it is difficult to say which is the more faithful. In one passage taken at random the first might appear to be more exact, but in another the situation will probably be reversed. The originality of both translations is particularly evident in their renderings of Old Testament citations. Since, however, the Septuagint version usually followed by these early writers so closely approximates the Vulgate version, it does seem that the more familiar Douay renderings might have been followed by both translators. Naturally this would be impossible in cases where a wide divergence exists between the citation in the text and the commonly accepted version. Although both translations are satisfactory, possibly the Newman translations read more easily and allow the ordinary reader better to grasp the spirit of the original.

There are those who consider it unfortunate that the original texts have not been included side by side with the translations as in the